

1527. Also, petition of the United Parlor, Native Sons of the Golden West, of San Francisco, Calif., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1528. By Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia: Petition of sundry citizens of the United States, against the universal military training, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1529. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition of Trout Lake Development Association, signed by C. A. Pearson, president; A. G. Belshims, secretary; Christian Guler, J. E. Reynolds, and C. H. Pearson, committee, opposing establishment of national park in Mount Adams district, Columbia National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1530. By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of the William G. Stratton Post, No. 59, of Ouray, Colo., relative to certain legislation for the protection of the Government, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 13, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, by a thousand tokens Thou hast shown that we are children of Thy care. Thou hast put at our command the mighty forces of this great Nation, greater forces than Thou hast ever committed into the hands of any organized society. We pray that in the use of the forces that Thou hast put at our command we may have a due regard for Thy glory and for the purpose of God in all government. Save us from the temptation of great riches and of great power. Keep us humbly following Thee, that we may accomplish Thy purpose in us as a Nation. For Christ's sake. Amen.

On request of Mr. BRANDEGEE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

INDIAN DEPREDAATION CLAIM (S. DOC. NO. 220).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Assistant Attorney General, submitting a judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of claimant in an Indian depredation case in the sum of \$1,115, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EINAR BOYDLER (S. DOC. NO. 219).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a judgment rendered by the Court of Claims amounting to \$262.36 in favor of Einar Boydler, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the fiscal year ended October 31, 1919, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EPIDEMIC OF INFLUENZA IN ALASKA (S. DOC. NO. 221).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a supplementary estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$80,072.85 to reimburse the Territory of Alaska for expenditures made in behalf of natives of Alaska during the epidemic of influenza, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. DOC. NO. 218).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Acting Attorney General, submitting supplementary estimates of appropriations in the sum of \$15,000 required for contingent expenses of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1920, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED (S. DOC. NO. 222).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of claims amounting to \$187,011.33 allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under

appropriations, the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 2775. An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain;

S. 3371. An act authorizing Gordon N. Peay, jr., his heirs and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the White River;

H. R. 396. An act to authorize the payment of certain amounts for damages sustained by prairie fire on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota;

H. R. 683. An act for the relief of William E. Johnson;

H. R. 3620. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Navigation to change the names of vessels;

H. R. 5665. An act for the relief of Carlow Avellina;

H. R. 10746. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Wrangell, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction, enlargement, and equipment of schools, and acquisition and construction of a water-supply system, the construction of a sewer system, the construction of a city dock and floating dock, and to levy and collect a special tax therefor; and

S. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to turn over to the State of Kansas emergency hospital equipment, to be used temporarily in emergency hospitals to be established in the State, and for other purposes.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I ask that an article by Frank H. Simonds on the peace treaty with Germany may be inserted in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The article referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Tribune, Jan. 25, 1920.]

PEACE HAS BEEN DECLARED IN A FAR FROM PEACEFUL EUROPE—MISTAKES HAVE BEEN MADE THAT APPEAR CERTAIN TO RESULT IN FUTURE CONFLICTS—GERMANY SEES A CHANCE TO TURN HER APPARENT DEFEAT INTO A REAL VICTORY.

[By Frank H. Simonds.]

"The actual putting into operation of the peace of Paris, to combine the several agreements of Versailles, St. Germain, and Neuilly under the name they will doubtless bear henceforth, and the date of the application of the terms of peace, January 10, 1920, mark one of the great historic moments of modern history. If one seek parallels they will be found only in the settlements of Westphalia, in 1648; of Utrecht, in 1712, and of Vienna, in 1815.

"In each case a new Europe emerged from a colossal struggle, and it is not less clear that a new Europe has emerged, however shadowy in form as yet, from the World War, which officially ends with the first month of 1920. Now, in the examination of this new Europe, it is essential first of all to compare the present situation with that of the Continent at the moment when the recent war broke out, that is, on August 1, 1914.

"At that date Europe was divided approximately evenly between two great groups of States, which were themselves nations with long traditions and well-defined policies. France, Russia, and Great Britain confronted Germany, Austria, and Italy. But the adherence of the British to the Franco-Russian group was more or less subject to a national, or at least a parliamentary referendum, before war could be declared, while the association of Italy with the Austro-German group was based on a positive alliance, but only for defense.

HOW IT CAME ABOUT.

"This grouping of powers had resulted from the rapid rise of Germany to continental domination in the years between 1870 and 1914—that is, between the Franco-Prussian War and the World War. The association of France, Britain, and Russia was due to the conflict between German purposes and the policies of the three nations. In annexing Alsace-Lorraine in 1871 Germany had made a permanent enemy of France; in joining Austria in barring Russian pathway through the Balkans to Constantinople Germany had driven Russia into the opposing camp, while the challenge to Britain on the sea had led the British to their historic course of intervention on the Continent, as the French under Louis XV and Napoleon had provoked similar intermixture.

"By contrast Austria, despite her defeats of 1866, had been drawn into the German orbit by fear of Russia and by the ever-growing menace of Pan-Slavism, acting upon her own Slav millions. Italy had been maneuvered into a similar relation by the cleverness of Bismarck in making use of French occupation of Tunis in 1881, which closed to Italy a promised land of colonial expansion and Mediterranean power.

"In the early years of the Triple Alliance, when it was faced by the Franco-Russian Alliance, which was manifestly peaceful in character, the groupings of powers had contributed to the preservation of peace. But more and more the Germans perceived that while their own rise and development had been more rapid than the Russian, their future was still dubious, if Russia remained united and was able to draw to her vast camp the small Slav races of Austria and the Balkans.

A SERIES OF CLASHES.

"In the years from 1905 to 1914, a full decade, therefore, we had a series of incidents, clashes between alliances; in Morocco, over Bosnia and in the Balkans, which resulted most unfavorably to the Triple Alliance, brought Britain into line with France and Russia, weakened Italy's adherence to the Triple Alliance, and compromised the existence of Austria. By 1913, at the end of the second Balkan war, the Germans saw clearly that unless a successful war could change the situation in their favor, Austria would be destroyed, the states arising on the ruins would be hostile to Germany, and Germany would be barred by the British on the seas and by the Russians on land, and would in the next half century sink to the rank of a second-class State, as contrasted with Britain, Russia, and the United States. In that situation Germany risked the World War, believing that for the moment military superiority was hers and victory would enable her to erect her own system in Europe and destroy the Slav menace by dividing the Slavs and provoking in Russia a revolution which would put Russia out of the world game for many years to come.

GERMANY'S MISCALCULATIONS.

"Germany's calculations, correct in the main, were upset by a misunderstanding of British policy at the outset and by the entrance of the United States in the final phase. Owing to these two circumstances, coupled with an underestimate of the fighting capacity of France, Germany lost the war, although she did achieve the ruin of Russia and came within an ace of winning the struggle before the United States arrived.

"But in the first weeks of 1918, when the Germans believed that they had won the war, the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, followed by the treaty of Bucharest, clearly indicated what the German policy was, and created in fact that Mitteleuropa, that coalition of States and races of Central Europe under German domination which was always in the German mind from the beginning. The design was to continue and increase the servitude of the Slav races of the east and south to the German and Hungarian minorities, occupy Poland, and administer the Baltic provinces.

"No such comprehensive or well-reasoned policy marked allied councils. The wholly vague formula of liberating enslaved races, with very little regard for historic, strategic, or economic considerations, served for the opponents of Germany during the long years when they were steadily forced to contemplate the possibility of losing the war outright, and the swiftness of the decision in the end surprised them without a statesmanlike solution.

POSITIVE RESULTS.

"The result has been that the Paris conference has proved wholly incapable of creating an order or a system on the ruins of a system undeniably wrecked by the war. So far as the British are concerned, they have effectively disposed of the German challenge on the water, both from the naval and the commercial sides. The German war fleet and the German merchant marine have disappeared; on the commercial and colonial sides the victory has been more complete than those won over Spain, Holland, or France in past centuries.

"As to the French, they have regained Alsace-Lorraine, temporarily, at least, escaped from the practical terrorization and paralysis of their national life by German menace, have better military frontiers, have a disarmed Germany before them, occupy the Rhine for the present, and the coal regions of the Saar may conceivably pass to them in perpetuity, while for 15 years at least any German attack will begin far within German territories and encounter the Rhine as a barrier. By contrast, both the French and the British have paid a terrible price for victory, the French vastly in excess of the British, and both will have a long struggle to regain national health.

ITALY'S GAINS.

"Italy, on her side, has regained her unredeemed territory, established herself at last on the crests of the Alps at the Brenner Pass, and achieved, with allied aid, the destruction of her former Austrian oppressor. She, like France and Britain, has acquired certain colonial lands, but wholly inferior even to those gained by France. She has, moreover, quarreled with her French, British, and American allies or associates, with the Jugo-Slavs, and with the Greeks, while her effort to occupy a portion of Asia Minor has brought her into conflict with the Turks and her mandate for Albania promises future expensive military operations.

"The significant fact is that the natural alliance between Britain, France, and Italy, the logical successor of the old Triple Entente, which might guarantee the peace of Paris, has not yet arrived, may not arrive, as a consequence of Italian resentment at Franco-British policies, while the presence of the United States as a guarantor of such an alliance—that is, of the situation created by the peace of Paris—is now hardly to be expected.

"Turning now to the center of Europe, we see that the Allies have endeavored to make good their promises of liberating the subject nationalities, but in doing this they have been guided by narrow and academic formulae rather than by economic, political, or strategic facts. They have accepted the destruction of Austria-Hungary, but they have not sought or achieved any stable equilibrium in its place. They have drawn boundary lines across the center of Europe, striving faithfully to follow ethnographic circumstances, but ignoring economic facts, thus condemning regions and peoples newly liberated from tyranny to misery, famine, extinction, if these boundaries are maintained.

"In neglecting the economic considerations they have been not less careless of the political. They have failed to prevent the clash between the Italian and the Jugo-Slav, the Serb and the Roumanian, the Pole and the Czech. Thus, instead of a new system of States mutually friendly and all associated with the western liberators in a virtual alliance to preserve the system created at Paris, instead of several States each possessing the necessary resources for a viable State, they have assisted at the erection of a crazy quilt of mutually hostile States on the foundations of the old Hapsburg Empire, several of them doomed to perish for economic reasons, several of them bitterly hostile to their liberators and ready to make terms with the old enemy.

POLAND AND ROUMANIA.

"Particularly in the matter of Poland and Roumania, each now become a State of considerable proportions, each with an area as great as Italy—Poland with a population of 30,000,000, Roumania with 17,000,000—the western nations have dealt with incredible stupidity, seeking to compel these two States to conform to academic ideas of ethnographic frontiers, usually incorrectly described. Thus, instead of having in the East and at the Russian boundaries two States capable of real development, the western allies have sacrificed Poland to Germany and alienated Roumania by seeking to deny Roumanian lands because of fear of ultimate Russian resentment.

"In the new Europe which we see at the present hour, then, the situation is this: France and Great Britain are unquestionably bound together by a community of interests and dangers which insure joint action for a long time. With them Belgium must be reckoned for obvious reasons. But Italian adherence to this Anglo-French bloc is far from certain. Looking eastward, Poland and Roumania, natural members of the western alliance, have been weakened, and, in the case of Roumania, alienated. In case of Bolshevik attack upon Poland the Allies have so wrought that Poland may be unable to resist the attack, while Roumania is bound to consult her own interests rather than act in conformity with western powers, which have consistently sacrificed her rights to Russian ambitions. As for the group of States on old Hungarian territory, Hungary and Austria are definitely hostile and necessarily driven to a future German alliance; Czechoslovakia is isolated and at odds with Poland; Jugoslavia is involved in fatally compromising disputes with Italy and with Roumania. Bulgaria, too, is forever hostile, while Greece has been sacrificed to this permanently hostile Bulgaria.

"Now, it is fairly plain that if Britain, France, Italy, Poland, Roumania, Jugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, and Greece could be united in a common policy of defense of European order and stability, the alliance thus constituted would be adequate to defeat any German or Russian assault, to prevent the development of a Russo-German alliance.

GERMAN'S CAPITAL CREDIT SUGGESTION.

"It is patent that if such a group of nations had the United States as a moral and economic, if not a military, partner, some real system might be evolved, even Austria and Hungary might

ultimately be drawn into a Danubian federation, rather than into a German combination, thus abolishing the economic impossibility of the present situation. But unhappily just this firm association has been prevented, perhaps permanently, by the progress of events in Paris and the unhappy effort to make peace without regard to historical, economic, or political facts, and solely with regard to academic principles abroad and domestic political circumstances at home.

THE OTHER PICTURE.

"Turning now to the other side of the picture we see, as against an Anglo-French alliance, still struggling to expand itself into a European system, two enormous facts, the one German and the other Russian, and both necessarily and so far as the future can be read, permanently hostile to the western combination. Germany has been conquered, but neither permanently crushed nor yet conciliated. Conciliation was at all times impossible, unless the French and Belgians were to be made the victims of German outrages and condemned to perish in a vain effort to restore German depredations without German indemnities. Permanent weakening was possible only so far as the Allies were able to create a new Europe which would be sufficiently strong to make a renewal of German assault impossible.

"I would not be understood as arguing that more territory should have been taken from the Germans, save in certain details on the Polish side. Germany probably would have been able in the future to retake such territory, and the creation of new Alsace-Lorraine would mean only poisoning anew the system of Europe. What I do mean is that if Poland had been properly assured of her Baltic exit and of her eastern frontiers, if Roumania and Jugoslavia had been sufficiently strengthened, saved from an empty quarrel over the Banat, if some form of friendly federation had been built upon the ruins of Austria-Hungary, the German would have found himself unable, with hope of victory, to undertake anew the battle for continental domination, and might have followed peaceful policies and become with time a good European.

"As it is, the German now looks out upon the east, with a Poland whose sea gate is reached through a corridor German cannon can close, whose single port of Danzig is only in part his own, whose eastern frontiers are open to Bolshevist attack, whose Ukrainian and Czech neighbors are hostile. Looking southward he sees a Middle Europe turned into chaos, Austria beckoning him to come as a master, Hungary equally sure to invite deliverance, economic and political, and Bulgaria totally unreconciled and still capable of useful aid if the old struggle is resumed.

"Beyond Bulgaria he perceives a Turkish and Mahometan world eruption. Whatever he may think of the vitality of Pan-Turanian dreams, he sees that millions of Turks, Tartars, Kurds, Turcomans, Arabs, Egyptians, all the way from the Aegean and the Nile to the frontiers of Afghanistan, and even beyond them in India, are restless or even fighting against his old allies, menacing Egypt and India, threatening Syria, where the French are; menacing Mesopotamia, where the British rule.

AND THE BOLSHEVISTS.

"Finally he discovers the great Russian Bolshevist wave rolling outward in all directions, marching toward the Pacific, the frontiers of India, the highlands of Asia Minor, sweeping down to the Black Sea, and making some sort of common policy with the Mahometan millions for attack upon Egypt and upon India. And he can equally clearly see that for these Russian Bolshevists, quite as much as for himself, the extinction of Poland is a matter of immediate importance.

"Now, the German has to make a great decision for the future. Will he accept his defeat, will he pay the price of losing the last war, expressed in money and in power, or will he seek to avoid the payment of this price by associating himself with the Bolshevist and the Mahometan? Will he become a 'good European', accept defeat as did the French after Napoleon fell, associate himself with his conquerors, permanently acknowledging British naval supremacy and commercial domination, or will he seek by a new combination to reopen the old battle, to escape the consequences of defeat, and renew his struggle for world hegemony, following European supremacy?

"It does not seem to me the answer is difficult to discover. No nation in all history would accept the fall Germany has suffered in the last five years as an end to national ambitions unless all chance of victory for the future, if the contest were reopened, should be eliminated. And the German can look at contemporary Europe and see possibilities of future success on all sides. He may choose an active or a passive rôle for the present, immediate or ultimate association with Russia, but in the meantime Russia works for him by assailing Britain in Egypt and in India, and in menacing Poland, the extinction of which must be his own first concern.

A NEW ALLIANCE SURE.

"Almost infallibly the new alliance in Europe, which will challenge whatever survives of the association of powers which won the last war, will be a Russo-German group. Almost equally certain this group will enlist the Mahometan bloc, which extends from Cairo to Kaoul. Such an alliance will have an enormous population, incalculable resources in men, materials, and supplies, and will be beyond the reach of sea power. It could only be checked if all the rest of the civilized world stood firm against it. But would it?

"Looking at Europe to-day, the German perceives that Italy is hardly to be counted upon by his old enemies; he perceives that Roumania has been practically lost by Anglo-American policies. He may exaggerate the weakness which has overtaken France as a result of the war, but the weakness is unmistakable. He may place too great value upon the present reaction in America against further European action, but the reaction is an unmistakable fact.

"But what is important to note is this circumstance: If you and I were Germans, who believed in 1914 that our country was called upon to fulfill a great world mission, if we thought in the well-known German manner then, would we now, when we were faced with a future which promised national decadence, if we accepted it, a long period of foreign occupation and an enormous payment to foreign Governments, a permanent abdication as one of the great world nations, resign our old vision and settle down to what lies ahead?

THE CURE.

"The answer seems to me clear. To cure Germany of her vast and evil dream we had not merely to defeat her in war, which we just barely succeeded in doing, but we had also to create a stable European system, which would be a barrier to her further efforts to realize her fond illusions. Just this the peace of Paris does not do. If German pathway was inviting in 1914, it is ten times as inviting now, whether one looks south toward Constantinople or east toward Moscow. Instead of solid barriers, Germany looks only at jerry-built States and Governments, incapable of standing unaided and lacking those guaranties from western nations which alone could insure their development into lasting edifices. A war has been lost, but to the German the opportunity has not been removed; rather it has been enhanced, in so far as Russia has been transformed from a certain enemy into a possible ally and perhaps an ultimate vassal.

"We come almost inevitably, then, to the conclusion that the Allies who won the war lost the peace. The great opportunity to erect barriers against a new German flood had disappeared. Instead we have not merely the old German menace, but the new Russian peril. If we had crushed bolshevism when the moment was favorable a year ago, Germany would have to-day looked out upon a Europe offering her no possible ally and no favorable field of exploitation; the saved Russia would have been a partner in our new system, a great force in our new Europe.

"Instead we failed and permanently alienated 125,000,000 Russians, who are to-day moving more and more clearly toward a temporary association with 75,000,000 Germans, who remain equally outside our new system, who hate us and our ideas with a hatred which is no longer to be mistaken. And in this Russo-German sea of hostile millions the little Slav and Latin States we have fashioned in the East and South are chips. They could hardly be maintained even if we sent vast armies to them now, once Russia begins in earnest or whenever Germany resumes.

SLAV AND TEUTON.

"Is it conceivable that the Slav and the Teuton will fight? In such a fight there would be salvation for the rest of the world. But the nations of the Entente are an enemy whom both detest far more than they detest each other. No; the thing seems fairly clear: In the new Europe, which begins with the present month, an alliance between the Slav and the Teuton to overthrow the settlement of the peace of Paris is almost inevitable.

"This is not to say that German armies will spring up overnight or a new German war arrive this year or next. What it does aim to assert is that the present conditions in Europe hold out so much hope to the German of ultimate realization of his old ambitions that he will not now lay them aside; rather he will cherish them and await the hour when they can be realized. He is powerless now, but his conquerors have totally failed to close his pathway, their hour is passing, their system is already threatened by deadly attack from Russia, their alliance is crumbling, America is gone, Italy patently bitter and resentful, Britain faces wasting exertions in all her far-flung Empire from Ireland to India; France, victorious, is almost bled white. The little races, newly liberated, hate each other

more than their old oppressors. In sum, the peace of Versailles, like the historic settlements of the past, only marks the end of one world-wide struggle to usher in the first act of another. In 1914 we, the western nations, had only one foe, and that was Germanism; to-day we have the old foe, but we have in addition another at least equally deadly, namely, bolshevism. Nor is it inconceivable that Germany herself, although losing the recent war, has opened a breach through which the new enemy may yet penetrate."

GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, on the 9th of this month, I think it was, there was some discussion on the floor of the Senate as to who was paying the cost of schools on grounds owned by the Government and in possession of the Navy Department and also as to the operation of places of amusement upon those grounds. The Secretary of the Navy seems to have taken notice of it and has sent letters to two or three Senators in which he explains the matter. I think his letter ought to be read by the Secretary into the RECORD, and I ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Reading Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 11, 1920.

MY DEAR SENATOR: With reference to Senate bill 3738, which abolishes the United States Housing Corporation, I desire to invite your attention to certain apparent misapprehensions on the part of the Congress in relation to the Navy Department's interest in housing projects built for it at Bremerton, Wash., at Indianhead, Md., and at South Charleston, W. Va., as noted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9, 1920.

The projects, including the schoolhouses—should they be transferred to the Navy—will be run without expense to the Federal Government. The Navy Department will continue to operate them in the present manner. The school-teachers are paid out of funds appropriated by the State and are employed through the State officials. While there are certain moving-picture houses running in buildings thus provided at the two latter places, there is no expense whatever involved to the Federal Government thereby. These are absolutely self-sustaining in every way. The rental obtained from the houses, hotel, and dormitories in question pays for their repair and maintenance, together with the light and water furnished.

To turn these projects over to the Treasury Department involves the suggestion of leasing certain lands to that department. The lands are an integral part of the Navy's activities, such as smokeless-powder factory at Indianhead and ordnance plant at South Charleston. It appears that the most economical and advantageous way not only for the Government but for the employees is to have these projects under the direct charge of the inspectors of ordnance in command at these two stations. The schoolhouse not only takes care of people living on Government reservations but also takes care of people in the vicinity, and without these schoolhouses Indianhead and South Charleston will lapse into the situation that existed prior to the war, where it was practically impossible for an employee or officer to give his children a common-school education. The Government in these cases is doing no more than that done by any reputable private corporation.

In order that the Navy may maintain and utilize the buildings in question it must charge a sufficient rent for the same to cover the cost of maintenance and operation. This is the present practice. The Navy can not allow employees to occupy these buildings for nothing. It is thus seen that the Federal Government will not be required to pay out any sums for these buildings, but, on the contrary, there should be turned into the Treasury each year the residue from the rentals over and above that required for operating expenses.

In view of the foregoing it is to the best interests of the Government that the Navy Department operate the Housing Corporation activities at Bremerton, Wash., at Indianhead, Md., and at South Charleston, W. Va. It is desired that such a change be made in the bill in conference.

This letter will explain the situation between the Navy and the United States Housing Corporation more fully and thus clear up the points which arose on the floor of the Senate on the 9th instant. I have sent a similar letter to Senators FERNALD, SMOOT, and KING.

Very truly, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy.

Senator PORTER J. McCUMBER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

REMOVAL OF SOLDIER DEAD FROM FRANCE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on Monday, at her request, I introduced a letter from Mrs. Griffiths relating to the problem of the transportation back to America of the dead bodies of those who lost their lives in the war. Some reflections in that letter, I am sorry to say, were made upon one Col. Kromer. I am in receipt of a short letter from a friend of that gentleman, an officer in the Army, who perhaps would not desire to have his name used. In view of Mrs. Griffiths's reflections upon Col. Kromer, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without the signature?

Mr. THOMAS. Without the signature.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1735 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE,
Washington, D. C., February 11.

Senator CHARLES S. THOMAS.

MY DEAR SENATOR: With reference to the letter from Mrs. Griffiths about Col. Kromer, which you had inserted in the RECORD of February 9, I am taking the liberty to request that you ask the War Department to investigate the case.

Col. Kromer is a warm personal friend of mine, having been my particular chum at West Point, and a more conscientious, hard-working, courteous man never lived. He returned from France in December and is now on duty at Fort Sam Houston, Tex. He was in this city during the month of January, and in telling me of his work in France with the graves registration service he told me the story of Mrs. Griffiths. It was quite different from that given by Mrs. Griffiths in her letter, and in publishing that letter without giving Col. Kromer a chance to reply I feel that you have done him a grave injustice.

We Army officers are quite helpless to defend ourselves from attacks in Congress, and perhaps I have no business to take up this matter with you. But, as a man, I feel I have the right to ask justice for my best friend, regardless of the fact that we are Army officers.

As to Col. Kromer's character, I should like to have you consult Mr. Sweet, Assistant Secretary Department of Commerce, who has known him since he was a boy and is mainly responsible for his being in the Army.

Very sincerely,

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Tuesday next at the close of the morning business I shall address the Senate upon some of the economic features of the German treaty.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have received telegrams from citizens of Jacksonville, Fla., urging the adoption of universal training, which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., February 11, 1920.

Senator D. U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We favor universal training. Please advise our congressional Representatives.

William N. Dunham, Ernest L. Landrum, Frank Cartnel, George W. Clark, Edward S. Diver, John H. Hall, John C. Temple, A. B. Potter, Loren H. Green.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., February 11, 1920.

Senator D. U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We ask congressional Representatives to vote for universal training. John C. Burrows, Bernard Thyson, Morgan Cress, James D. Stuart, Ellis Crenshaw, Edward S. Spencer, Henry Doig, J. N. Wilson, William E. Ross.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., February 11, 1920.

Senator D. U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We urge vote for universal training by congressional Representatives. C. J. Williams, Harry Hasson, D. M. Jones, Joshua Chase, Marcus Fagg, Clifford Payne, Waldo Cummer, Myron L. Howard, John P. Murphy, Paul Saunders.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from Strongfellow Padgett & Co., of Jacksonville, Fla., and a memorial of the Grain Dealers' National Association, of Toledo, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Gronna wheat guaranty bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the National League of Commission Merchants, of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the manner in which perishable vegetables are being handled

by the American Railway Express Co., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Southern Cattlemen's Association, of Little Rock, Ark., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Kendrick-Kenyon bills to regulate the packing business, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petition of L. L. Hine, city clerk of Bradentown, Fla., praying for universal military training, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Rotary Club of Ocala, Fla., and a petition of Chase & Co., of Jacksonville, Fla., praying for the ratification of the peace treaty, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Gronna wheat guaranty bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the United Women of Maryland, Second Division, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide prompt and adequate means of protection for the Republic of Armenia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions of Meade Post, No. 14, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Sterling; of Pap Thomas Post, No. 52, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Great Bend; of Jules Williams Post, No. 155, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Oskaloosa; and of McCook Post, No. 51, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Iola, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called Fuller pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of the Mennonite Church of Meade, of sundry citizens of Butler County, in the State of Kansas, and of sundry citizens of Mayes County, Okla., remonstrating against compulsory military training, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of Hannah Camp, No. 23, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, of Traverse City, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to pension soldiers of the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Grand Ledge, Mich., praying for the passage of the so-called Fuller pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the National Farm Loan Association, of Northport, Mich., praying for the passage of the so-called Smoot land-bank bill, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 19, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Detroit, Mich., praying for a two-year extension of Government control of railroads, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Division No. 385, Order of Railway Conductors, of Ionia, Mich., and a memorial of Local Lodge No. 308, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, of Traverse City, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Cummins-Esch railroad bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of the Civic and Commercial Association of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of a national highway system, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a memorial of Local Division No. 385, Order of Railroad Conductors, of Ionia, Mich., and a memorial of the Pere Marquette Board of Adjustment, Brotherhood of Railway Employees, of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the adoption of the antistrike clause in the so-called Cummins-Esch railroad bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

LANDS IN HAWAII.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3461) to provide for the exchange of Government lands for privately owned lands in the Territory of Hawaii, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 424) thereon.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY EXCHANGE COMMISSION.

Mr. THOMAS. With the consent of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask that that committee may be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) authorizing the appointment of an international monetary exchange commission, which was referred to that committee on the day of its introduction, and that the joint

resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is here objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 3904) to amend the revenue act of 1918 with respect to yachts and pleasure boats; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 3905) granting a pension to Anna M. Falls (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 3906) granting a pension to Margaret I. Paulsen; and

A bill (S. 3907) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Fuller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 3908) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act permitting any person who has served in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in the present war to retain his uniform and personal equipment, and to wear the same under certain conditions," approved February 28, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON (for Mr. JONES of New Mexico):

A bill (S. 3909) to amend section 6 of the Federal aid road act; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. KING:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) prescribing the method by which the war profits and excess profits taxes imposed by title 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919, shall be computed for the calendar year 1919; to the Committee on Finance.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 11, 1920:

S. 3327. An act granting certain rights of way and exchanges of the same across the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, in the State of Utah; and

S. 3452. An act authorizing the city of Detroit, Mich., a municipal corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the American channel of the Detroit River to Belle Isle.

ADDRESS BY JOHN BASSETT MOORE.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I have here a copy of a very able address delivered by Hon. John Bassett Moore, vice president of the executive council of the International High Commission at the second Pan American Financial Conference, in the city of Washington, which I desire to have printed as a public document. Perhaps the first step toward this end is its reference to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The address will be so referred.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a communication from the president of the Chamber of Commerce of Perth Amboy, N. J., inclosing the official vote or referendum taken on four propositions relating to the treaty by that organization.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERTH AMBOY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

Perth Amboy, N. J., February 10, 1920.

Senator HITCHCOCK,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am inclosing a copy of a referendum taken by our chamber of commerce which indicates the feeling on the League of Nations. This referendum was taken under authorization of our board of directors and conducted under the usual restrictions as to secrecy and honesty of ballot.

We have a membership which is about one-half manufacturers, one-fourth merchants, and the other fourth civic members, representing professions and trades. This was conducted so that we might have tabulated the feeling of our community as represented by its business interests. Our board of directors took no other official action.

Sincerely, yours,

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
I. T. MADSEN, *President.*

Attest:

F. E. HILTON, *Secretary.*

Official referendum taken by the Chamber of Commerce, Perth Amboy, N. J., Feb. 5, 1920, upon the League of Nations as per the four following propositions.

First proposition: I am in favor of the League of Nations as included in the peace treaty with Germany in its original form as submitted to the Senate by President Wilson	22
Second proposition: I am against the League of Nations in any form, and do not believe that it should be included in the peace treaty	22
Third proposition: I am in favor of the League of Nations with such reservations as will command the necessary two-thirds vote in the Senate to ratify same	73
Fourth proposition: I am for the League of Nations with reservations as submitted by Senator LODGE	66
Total votes cast	183
Votes in favor of League of Nations in some form	161
Votes against League of Nations in any form	22

Above is the result of a secret mail referendum vote taken by the chamber of commerce, Perth Amboy, N. J., February 5, 1920.
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
F. E. HILTON, Secretary.

QUESTIONS OF ORDER.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, on June 30, 1919, I submitted a resolution to amend the rules of the Senate and it was referred to the Committee on Rules. The resolution proposed that when a point of order was to be made in the Senate it must be made at the proper time, and that the proper time was before any discussion had ensued on the merits of the controversy before the Senate. The whole object of the resolution was to save the time of the Senate. I have noticed, and other Senators have also noticed, that the Senate might discuss a proposition for two or three days upon its merit, and at the expiration of that time some Senator would raise a point of order to the proposition, and it would go out on the point of order. My proposed amendment of the rule is designed to make the same rule apply in the Senate that applies in the House; that is, if a point of order lies against a proposition, it must be made at the proper time, in order to save discussion on the merits of the proposition.

Although the Committee on Rules reported this proposition out unanimously, some question has arisen in regard to it; and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution (S. Res. 104) may be recommitted to the Committee on Rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NUGENT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SALE OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT STORES.

Mr. RANSDELL. I present a petition signed by several hundred grocers of the city of New Orleans, La., which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

Mr. RANSDELL. I wish to make a very brief statement. The petition shows that the United States Government, through the operation of its Army subsistence stores, is working a great injustice to the grocers of the country, and "we, the undersigned retail grocers of New Orleans earnestly protest against the continuance of a policy which is detrimental to the interest and welfare of the legitimate distributor of foodstuffs, besides being unfair, undemocratic, and un-American.

"The grocers are loyal citizens, contributing to the support of their country and paying, as they do, Government income taxes, city, State, and municipal taxes. During the war they very patriotically sold all of the licensed commodities at cost, in order to help win the war. These licensed commodities figured about 75 per cent of their entire stock.

"We submit that this policy of our Government is ruinous, not only to the retailer, but is reflected on the jobber, manufacturer, and producer, and its continued operation will surely cause a great upheaval of business conditions in the near future."

I will state in passing that I understand the practice is soon to be abandoned by the War Department.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question. Did I understand him to say that the maintenance of these retail grocery stores has been abandoned by the War Department?

Mr. RANSDELL. I did not so state. I said that I understood they were soon to be abandoned. I suppose when they get rid of the surplus stores that they have on hand they will be closed. My information is rather indefinite, I will state to the Senator, but that is the best information I have.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I asked the question because I have had some letters from keepers of grocery stores and similar supply stores in my State complaining of the institution of these stores by the War Department. Does the Senator happen to know whether these retail grocery stores instituted by the War Department sell to everybody or confine their trade to people of the Army? Do they compete—

Mr. RANSDELL. My understanding is that they sell to anyone who wishes to buy the goods, but I really can not give the

Senator any very satisfactory information. I have understood that they sell to anyone; that they are trying to get rid of the goods they have on hand.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was somewhat surprised when I found that the War Department was engaging in that activity. I assumed that it was to be only temporary, while they were disposing of the surplus stores that had been bought by the Government for the conduct of the war.

I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs if he has any information about this matter. I do it because, as I said, some of my constituents are interested in the question and have displayed considerable anxiety, and I wondered if the chairman of the committee has any information from the department as to its intention in the matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, Mr. President, I have no definite information. I have understood that the Government was selling these surplus stores and selling them at a certain percentage above cost. I assume that that price is lower, perhaps, than the ordinary retailer could sell the same goods for. It is a part of the effort to reduce the high cost of living, and it has been a failure.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I supposed it was, but it is a convenience of the public, I have no doubt, to buy goods cheaper than the regular stores sell them for. The question of the wisdom of the policy may not be an unmixed one. I assume that the Government has an amount of stores on hand. It does not want to destroy them and can not keep them forever, and they should be disposed of; yet at the same time my constituents who write to me about the matter seem to feel aggrieved that they should be selected, having done their share in maintaining the expenses of the war and having subscribed to every patriotic fund that was raised for its conduct. They seem to think that it was a hardship upon them that they should now be thrown into competition, if you can call it that, because it is impossible for them to compete with the Government, which is selling at wholesale purchase prices in competition with citizens of the Government, who have to charge some profit over and above the wholesale price which they paid for the goods, and it is really a hardship upon them.

I know nothing about the intention of the department. I have no doubt the people could stand such a competition if it is for a limited time and for a limited amount, but, of course, if it is to be in any way worked into a permanent policy it would be ruinous, and it could undoubtedly be applied to every department of the Government.

Mr. RANSDELL. I merely wish to add that I know nothing in the world about the policy of the department. I assume that it is merely trying to dispose of the surplus now on hand as the result of the sudden closing of the war. I am sure the department does not intend to attempt to go into the business of retailing groceries in competition with the grocery merchants of the country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, it is my information that the department has been more criticized for failure to dispose of the surplus goods than for its action in so doing. The complaint can not be based upon very serious considerations because the quantity on hand can not possibly last long enough to seriously disturb the retail market anywhere. I think the officials of the Government would be very much subject to criticism if they kept on hand goods which had been paid for by the taxpayers and for which the Government no longer had any use. On the other hand, the Government would be criticized probably also if it turned these goods over at a low price to the wholesalers and permitted them to make a profit and then to the retailers and permitted them to make a profit.

It seems to me the plan that has been adopted by the War Department is on the whole a wise one, to dispose of the goods direct to the consumers at something above the cost price to the Government. The competition which is engendered is brief, and it is the lesser of the evils involved.

My criticism of the department has been that it has been too slow in disposing of its surplus goods. We need an immediate reduction of taxation. The department has surplus goods on hand which will materially mitigate the burdens of taxation by reducing the indebtedness. As I remember a recent statement by the Secretary of the Navy, we have reduced the indebtedness of the United States something like a thousand million dollars by selling surplus goods in this country and abroad. I believe that the policy adopted by the department is subject to commendation rather than criticism, and that whatever disturbance exists will be very short lived.

SALE OF SHIPS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I hope the Senator did not understand me to be criticizing the department in the matter at all. I am not. I would not criticize any department or any official of

the Government upon a matter about which I knew nothing. I was asking for information simply, and stated that I had letters from some constituents of a similar nature to the petition which the Senator from Louisiana read. I hope that the department will at best give us information as to how long these sales are to continue.

I have no doubt the Government has got to dispose of its surplus war material. In some cases, I suppose, it will be done at a sacrifice. I read an article in one of the Washington newspapers last evening stating that the entire fleet of ships which had been taken from Germany was to be sold, and the article complained that they were being sacrificed, and sold at from one-half to one-third of what they were worth, and being sold to one purchaser, without any competition and upon conditions which prevented other would-be purchasers from competing. As to the truth of that I do not know.

I was surprised to read that article, Mr. President, because I had thought it was the policy of the Government to have and maintain a large Government-owned merchant marine. If that is the policy of the Government, it would seem to me to be exceedingly unwise, just as we have secured the best merchant-marine fleet in one block, as the result of the war, immediately to dispose of it to a concern which, the article to which I refer stated, was flying a foreign flag and was not altogether beyond criticism in some of its operations. To me any foreign flag is yet a foreign flag, I will say to the Senator from Washington; and the International Mercantile Marine, if that be the name of the company, was stated by this article to be a British concern, upon the vessels of which the British Government had some call to use as a part of its auxiliary naval force.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I did not hear the first statement made by the Senator from Connecticut, but, as I understand, he refers to some statements in a newspaper with reference to a purported alleged sale of the German ships. I will say that I called up the Shipping Board this morning to inquire in reference to this matter. I had been told that it had been stated that they were going to sell the ships and close the deal on next Monday. I could not believe that there was any truth in that. However, I called them up, and they advised me that they simply expect to open bids and receive proposals on next Monday; that after those bids are submitted and opened they, of course, expect to consider them and take into account the entire situation with reference to the ships, and then to determine whether they will accept or reject any of the bids.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield, Mr. President?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. KING. It has been charged in several newspapers—editorials have been written charging the same thing—that a secret arrangement, a secret contract, had been entered into between the Shipping Board and a certain corporation by which a certain number of German ships would be sold for \$28,000,000. Is there any truth in that charge?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not know whether there is any truth in it or not; I do not believe there is. This administration is not of my party; the Shipping Board officials do not belong to my party; but I believe that they are honest men; I believe that they are patriotic American citizens; I believe that they are seeking to do what they think is the wise and businesslike thing to do; and until there is very convincing proof to the contrary I will not believe that they have entered into any such agreement as that which has been alluded to. I feel satisfied that they have not done so.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, has the Senator from Washington made special inquiry with reference to the specific matter as to whether or not those officials have had any understanding, express or implied, with this particular corporation as to the sale of those ships?

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is the first suggestion that has come to me with reference to anything of that sort. I have not gone especially into it, Mr. President, because I consider that Congress is the legislative branch of the Government; I consider the Shipping Board as a part of the administrative branch of the Government; we have invested them with certain administrative authority, and I assume that they will discharge their responsibilities in the way that they think is wisest and to the best interests of the country.

I have heard that some of these things were being contemplated, and I have made some inquiries with reference to them and as to the situation generally. They have advised me as I have stated here. They have also stated that, from the surveys they have made, it looks like it will cost fifty or sixty million dollars to put the ships in proper condition, and they say it is a proposition which they feel must be given consideration as to whether it would be wise for the Govern-

ment to appropriate fifty or sixty million dollars and expend it on those ships, and then keep the ships, or whether it would be wiser to sell the ships and allow private parties to make the repairs. I think it is a matter that ought to be given very careful consideration. I think it is a matter that we ourselves could not very well decide, but that probably must be left to an administrative officer.

I have been assured by them, although I have not asked them specifically—because, as I have said, the suggestion which the Senator made has not come to me before—I have been assured through the representatives of the board that they expect to look into the matter very carefully and to take into account all the various conditions concerning it and to determine what would be the wisest thing for the Government to do.

I will say, further, that Chairman Payne, of the Shipping Board, telephoned me a short time ago asking to appear before the Committee on Commerce at 2.30 o'clock to-day to explain the situation as it is now presented to the Shipping Board. That is all the information I have with reference to the matter.

Mr. RANSDALL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. RANSDALL. I merely wish to ask the Senator if the Senate Committee on Commerce has not been having hearings for some time—very elaborate and comprehensive hearings—on the general question of what shall be done with our fleet of ships?

Mr. JONES of Washington. We have been having hearings with a view to determining the policy which shall be pursued in the future.

Mr. RANSDALL. And do not the committee expect to have the Shipping Board itself give its ideas as to what shall be done?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, certainly.

Mr. RANSDALL. We are trying to get all the light possible on the question?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. RANSDALL. And that would include, I take it, the disposition of the German ships as well as of others?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, certainly. I had hoped that the representatives of the Shipping Board would appear first and present their suggestions, but they have asked that they might come in last. They are apparently seeking information, as we are, with reference to the determination of a general policy for the future.

Mr. RANSDALL. If the Senator will permit me, I desire to say that I indorse every word he has said about the patriotism of the Shipping Board and its attempt to do exactly what is right and proper in the premises. It is ridiculous, in my judgment, to think that they would dispose of this great fleet of German ships at any such price as the newspapers have stated, or that they would do so without first making every effort to ascertain exactly what those ships are worth and what can be secured for them in the markets of the world. I am sure there is nothing in the statement which has been made in reference to the matter.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Washington yield for a moment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KING. Since the Senator from Washington has been upon the floor I have talked over the telephone with Judge Payne, of whom, of course, no eulogy is necessary, because of his ability and his integrity. He tells me apropos of this charge that there is not a scintilla of truth in it; that it is an absolute falsehood.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was satisfied of that.

Mr. BORAH. What is it that is an absolute falsehood?

Mr. KING. The charge that a secret agreement or any agreement has been entered into by which the German ships shall be sold for \$28,000,000 to a certain organization.

Mr. ASHURST. I should like to know if it is an absolute falsehood that they are going to sell \$154,000,000 worth of ships for \$28,000,000? That is what they are trying to do, as I shall develop in a few moments when I can get the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am certainly glad to receive information along those lines from the other side of the Chamber. If it came from this side of the Chamber—

Mr. ASHURST. There are Senators on this side of the Chamber who state facts as they exist, without regard to whether the facts strike Republicans, Democrats, or Prohibitionists.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am glad of it.

Mr. BORAH. May their tribe increase.

Mr. ASHURST. It will.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, of course the mere making of an inquiry as to the facts should not be considered as a reflection upon the patriotism or integrity of these men; but, as I view this matter, it involves a great question of policy. It is not merely a question of disposing of these particular ships, but

certainly that involves the question of what the policy of the Government is to be with reference to the building of a great merchant marine. I think if it should cost \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 to put these ships in such condition as would enable them to be operated, it might be well invested if it were done in consonance with a policy which was going to enable us to hold our part of the commerce of the world against our neighbors.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. The ships are proposed to be sold for \$28,000,000. They approximate 350,000 tons. At the price stated it amounts to \$80 per ton. England offered \$125 a ton for this tonnage which it is now proposed to sell for \$80 a ton. It would cost \$60,000,000 to bring this incomparable fleet of 30 ships that we took from the Germans to a point of recondition where they could be operated. Add \$60,000,000 to the \$28,000,000 and you have \$88,000,000. The fleet is worth \$154,000,000 at prewar prices, and it is worth \$300,000,000 at present prices; yet it is proposed to be sold for \$28,000,000.

I am going to say more about this subject when I get the floor in my own right. I have a few facts here which the country ought to know about; indeed, I will ask unanimous consent at this juncture to introduce a joint resolution, and I ask permission to speak for five minutes on the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. ASHURST. I will ask that the joint resolution be read, for I propose to ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 155) directing the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation to sell no vessels belonging to the United States except at public sale was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation proposes to sell on February 16, 1920, to the International Mercantile Marine Co. and its affiliated companies the following vessels taken by the United States from the Imperial German Government during the Great War, to wit: *Grosser Kurfurst (Aeolus)*, 13,108 gross tonnage; *Kaiser Wilhelm II (Agamemnon)*, 19,360 gross tonnage; *Amerika (America)*, 22,621 gross tonnage; *Koeln (Amphion)*, 7,409 gross tonnage; *Neckar (Antigone)*, 9,835 gross tonnage; *Bohemia (Artemis)*, 8,413 gross tonnage; *Rhaetia (Black Arrow)*, 6,599 gross tonnage; *Prinz Eitel Friedrich (De Kalb)*, 7,797 gross tonnage; *Wittekind (Freedom)*, 5,640 gross tonnage; *Peruv (Eten)*, 8,500 gross tonnage; *George Washington (George Washington)*, 25,569 gross tonnage; *Frederich der Grosse (Huron)*, 10,771 gross tonnage; *Vaterland (Leviathan)*, 54,281 gross tonnage; *Konig Wilhelm II (Madawaska)*, 9,409 gross tonnage; *Martha Washington (Martha Washington)*, 8,312 gross tonnage; *Barbarossa (Mercury)*, 10,983 gross tonnage; *Prinz Joachim (Moccasin)*, 4,760 gross tonnage; *Kronprinzessin Cecilie (Mount Vernon)*, 25,070 gross tonnage; *Pennsylvania (Nansemond)*, 13,332 gross tonnage; *Prinz Eitel Friedrich (Otsago)*, 4,650 gross tonnage; *Prinz Oskar (Orion)*, 6,026 gross tonnage; *Hamburg (Powhatan)*, 10,531 gross tonnage; *Princess Irene (Pocahontas)*, 10,892 gross tonnage; *Bulgaria (Philippines)*, 11,440 gross tonnage; *President Grant (President Grant)*, 18,172 gross tonnage; *Princess Alice (Princess Mattioka)*, 10,891 gross tonnage; *Rhein (Susquehanna)*, 10,058 gross tonnage; *Mark (Swanne)*, 6,493 gross tonnage; *Kronprinz Wilhelm (Von Steuben)*, 15,000 gross tonnage; *Wyandotte*, 2,450 gross tonnage; and

Whereas the said United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation apparently proposes that said vessels and all thereof shall be sold to the said International Mercantile Marine Co. and its affiliated companies for the gross sum of \$28,000,000, notwithstanding the prewar valuation of said vessels was fixed at the sum of \$160,000,000: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That neither the fleet of vessels nor any individual vessel taken by the United States from the Imperial German Government during the Great War shall be sold except to the highest bidder for cash in hand, after proposals to sell such vessels shall have been widely published for at least three months next preceding the date of sale and at a figure commensurate with their value.

During the reading of the joint resolution,

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt the Secretary to say that I will not ask that the names of the ships be read. The list embraces the large and expensive liners seized from Germany. One of them is the *Leviathan*, of 54,200 tons capacity, which carried 160,000 soldiers across the sea during the war. Another is the *George Washington*, which carried the President to Europe and return. I will ask that the names of the ships be included in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator if the list included in his joint resolution is the same list that was printed in the Washington Times last night?

Mr. ASHURST. I do not know; I presume it is.

After the reading of the joint resolution,

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, these ships, 30 in number, aggregate about 350,000 tons. At a price of \$28,000,000 they would bring \$80 a ton. I repeat that Great Britain offered

\$125 a ton for them, and yet they are to be sold at \$80 a ton. The prewar price of these vessels was \$154,000,000. I drew the resolution hurriedly, and instead of the prewar price being \$160,000,000 it is \$154,000,000.

What are these ships which it is proposed shall be sold on next Monday?

The *Vaterland* was rechristened the *Leviathan* after being seized by the United States. She is the biggest ship afloat, boasting 54,281 tons. When seized she was valued at \$10,000,000. The Shipping Board now proposes to sell her to the International Mercantile Marine at \$80 a ton, at which price she will bring about \$4,300,000.

The *Kronprinzessin Cecilie* has about half the tonnage of the *Vaterland*, but is reckoned a very big ship. Her tonnage is 25,070, and at the sale price proposed by the Shipping Board she will bring only \$2,005,000. She is easily worth more than twice that sum. After her seizure she was renamed the *Mount Vernon*.

The *Kaiser Wilhelm II*, Americanized as the *Agamemnon*, has a tonnage of 19,360 and a passenger-carrying capacity of 2,417. She is purely a passenger ship, having no cargo space. She is a gorgeously equipped vessel, providing every modern comfort and convenience.

The *Princess Irene*, renamed the *Pocahontas* after her capture by the United States, is small in tonnage by comparison with the *Vaterland*, being only 10,892 tons, but larger than the *Vaterland* in passenger-carrying capacity. She has accommodations for 2,384, as against 2,264 on the *Vaterland*. At the rate per ton asked by the Shipping Board she will bring only \$875,000.

The *President Grant*, which naturally retained her patriotic name after her capture from the Germans, has a tonnage of 18,172, which, at \$80 per ton, would put her sale price at about \$1,450,000. She has the greatest passenger-carrying capacity of the fleet, accommodating 3,303. She, also, is beautifully equipped.

The *Kronprinz Wilhelm* was renamed the *Von Steuben*. Her capacity is 15,000 tons, but she carries 1,511 passengers, and is, therefore, no infant among ships. Removing the United States flag from her peak and replacing it with the British flag will net this country \$1,200,000, which is little better than giving her away "at a mere fraction of her value."

The *George Washington*, like the *President Grant*, retained her name after her seizure. She was used by President Wilson and his party on their several trips to Europe during the negotiations which resulted in the League of Nations. She is 25,569 tons burden and carries 2,755 passengers. If sold at the rate per ton acceptable to the Shipping Board, she will bring a little over \$2,000,000.

It is proposed now that these ships shall be sold, forsooth, because it will cost \$60,000,000 to put them into a condition of efficiency where they can be used.

I ask leave at this point to have read a letter I received this morning from Judge John Barton Payne, chairman of the Shipping Board, on this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The letter was read, as follows:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

February 12, 1920.

MY DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: Answering your inquiry re sale of the ex-German passenger ships, the reasons were principally these:

1. It is the opinion of the Shipping Board that we will probably not be able to successfully operate passenger ships with prohibition in effect in competition with foreign ships which sell liquor.

The reason why is: In December we fitted out the *Moccasin* to sail to South America. Her berths were all sold. When I announced that, in view of the policy of the Congress of the country, Government ships would not be permitted to sell liquor, one-half of the sailings were immediately canceled.

2. We advertised the ex-German ships, and for 20 were offered \$20,000,000. We had a careful calculation made as to the cost of reconconditioning these ships for passenger service, and this reached the sum of \$57,000,000. In view of the present situation it did not seem to us that we were justified in incurring so large an expense.

3. Conditions in the shipping world are such that it is our conviction that there will never be a time when we can sell ships to better advantage than now, and since it is our conviction that the ships can be successfully operated in private ownership, we believe the sale should be made.

4. Two conditions are insisted upon by the board:

(a) That the ships shall remain under the American flag.

(b) That they are to be sailed in the routes indicated by the Shipping Board. This, we believe, will adequately protect the United States.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN BARTON PAYNE,
Chairman.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I need not say that neither my remarks nor the joint resolution I have introduced constitute a reflection on the Shipping Board. It might just as well be said when I take an appeal from a nisi prius court to another tribunal that I am trying to insult the nisi prius court. If it be a reflection on the Shipping Board to ask that the ships be not sold, it might as well be said when you petition for a rehearing in the Supreme Court of the United States that you are making some reflection on that great court.

I am making no reflection on anybody. I am not even reflecting on "John Barleycorn." But, Mr. President, we talk of small leaks and we talk of inefficiency here and speak of heavy expenditures; but here is a great fleet which American genius and American courage and the fortunes of war put into our hands—350,000 tons—about to be sold at a grossly inadequate value. The great statesman, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], stood for months trying to get a few ships for the United States. He was trying to build up a merchant marine. His speeches were published throughout the United States, showing the necessity for a second line of the Navy, to wit, carriers of all kinds. His speeches convinced me. The statesmanship of his remarks and the remarks of other Senators, showing the need of a fleet to carry the commerce of our country, seemed to be convincing to all. Now, since the fortunes of war and American money and American genius have put this fleet of 350,000 tons into our hands, we are proposing to dispose of it for \$28,000,000, forsooth, because we can not get a higher bid!

Mr. President, I will guarantee to the Shipping Board that if they will announce that on the 1st day of March an ocean liner will dip her prow into the water and will start for San Francisco, passing the placid blue of the Caribbean, passing through the Panama Canal, and over the Pacific for 2,500 miles as she goes northward, every berth will be occupied whether there is to be any liquor on board or not. I will guarantee that American citizens in New York and throughout the whole eastern country will flock to the steamship offices by the thousand to go through the canal on that American ship to the California coast. Why, they can carry 50,000 passengers a month if they will only establish a line of ships plying between San Francisco and New York. But hold! such steamers plying between the East and West might reduce freight rates and passenger rates; therefore we must have no line of ships plying between San Francisco and New York, because the eight transcontinental railroad lines are going to see to it, if they can, that there is no competition by water between the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts. I wonder if that be the reason why we are to have no steamers carrying passengers and freight between our two shores?

We know, Mr. President, what the transcontinental railway companies did on the question of Panama Canal tolls. They were so influential that they induced Congress—a Democratic Congress—to violate its own pledges and go back on its promises, and require American ships to pay toll as they went through an American canal.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ASHURST. I will yield in just a moment. I have some figures in my mind that I want to state, and I will not yield at this time.

So, Mr. President, I want here, as a Senator and as an American citizen, to protest against any action which will dispose of this fleet. It is necessary as a second line of defense for our Navy. This fleet is necessary to serve as a part of our merchant marine. We obtained it by the fortunes of war. If we have trouble again, there will be another request for several hundred millions more to build more ships to replace these that we sell next Monday. Against that kind of statesmanship I protest. Against that kind of inefficiency I protest. I care not who may be responsible, whether he be Democrat or Republican, or whether he be high or low in official circles, it makes no difference to me.

That is all I have to say. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of this resolution.

Mr. POMERENE and Mr. BRANDEGEE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; I yield the floor.

Mr. POMERENE. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield for a question, then.

Mr. POMERENE. Can the Senator from Arizona advise the Senate what, if any, notice was given by the Shipping Board of this proposed sale—in other words, what, if any, opportunity has been given for competitive bidding?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator from Georgia can answer that question, I shall be glad to have him do so. I can not.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have been advised that there has been no sale proposed, but that the purpose is, at the time stated, to accept competitive bids.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, not to accept, but to receive competitive bids.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. To receive them, I mean.

Mr. KING. To open them.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. To accept them in the sense of receiving them. I did not mean to close the trade, but that no trade has been made at all, and that on the day named the board intends to open the subject and take bids then, open to the world.

Mr. POMERENE. If that be true, how does the Senator account for Mr. Payne's letter, in which he says that he believes this figure of \$28,000,000 is the highest sum they can get? I am glad to get information. I hope the Senator is right.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not know. I have called up the Shipping Board and asked them myself, and was told that the purpose was publicly to take bids at the time named. When is it?

Mr. ASHURST. On Monday, the 16th of this month.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, surely if they are asking for bids, and expect to receive them, they must have in contemplation the acceptance of these bids. They certainly are not asking for bids purely out of a sense of amusement.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, not at all. I did not mean that. I was simply seeking to indicate that the public had not been closed out of bidding. They claim at the Shipping Board, I know, that it is their purpose, and that they have so advertised, that at some day named the public will have the right to bid, ship by ship; but I have not the information so definitely. I am satisfied that there is such a purpose.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will allow me to make another observation, I have some information which leads me to believe that the public in the past has not had the opportunity to bid for some of these vessels that it should have had. I think we are all more or less interested in that subject.

I should like to ask another question, if I may. Has the Commerce Committee, or any other committee of the Senate, investigated and made any report to the Senate as to whether at this particular time we should or should not dispose of these vessels?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the Committee on Commerce has been holding hearings every day for a couple of weeks with a view to getting information upon which to base a recommendation to Congress as to a permanent policy.

Mr. POMERENE. Is it proposed to sell these ships before this committee shall have an opportunity to come to a conclusion and make a recommendation?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, Mr. President, I understand that bids have been received. The Senator heard the letter read.

Mr. ASHURST. Let me read again two paragraphs of this letter, to wit, paragraphs 2 and 3. I will omit the paragraph regarding prohibition:

(2) We advertised the ex-German ships, and for 20 were offered \$20,000,000. We had a careful calculation made as to the cost of reconditioning these ships for passenger service, and this reached the sum of \$57,000,000. In view of the present situation, it did not seem to us that we would be justified in incurring so large an expense.

(3) Conditions in the shipping world are such that it is our conviction that there will never be a time when we can sell ships to better advantage than now; and since it is our conviction that the ships can be successfully operated in private ownership, we believe the sale should be made.

Mr. ASHURST. Judge Payne has not said in this letter when the sale will be made. I assume, from what I have read in the dispatches, that it will be made on Monday. In fact, I talked with Mr. Payne over the telephone yesterday, but because I do not accurately remember what he said about the time of sale I will not attempt to quote it.

Mr. POMERENE. The letter seems to be based upon the theory that it is conceded that the Government ought to sell these ships. I should like to have some information on that

subject. I confess that I am just a little bit jealous of these ships. I do not want them to get out of our clutches if it is at all possible to keep them. The question of operation, whether it shall be private or public operation, is another question.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator let me interject right there that, of course, my examination is brief and hasty, and what I know about shipping could be written on a caramel wrapper, but I do know a few obvious plain things. The fleet could not be duplicated to-day for \$300,000,000. Now, the Senator may be assured that I am reasonably accurate in that statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator means the one that is to be sold?

Mr. ASHURST. The one that is to be sold could not be duplicated to-day for \$300,000,000.

Mr. BRANDEGEE and Mr. FLETCHER addressed the Chair. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the last sentence in the letter of Judge Payne, which has just been read, is:

We believe the sale should be made.

That states the conclusion to which the Shipping Board have come; and evidently, unless their opinion changes, they are going to sell those vessels at such price as is satisfactory to them.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] a few minutes ago, in discussing this subject, stated that in his opinion the question of the sale of these vessels was one for an administrative officer. I can not speak with authority about the provisions of the legislation which created the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation. It may be that that legislation authorizes the sale by the board.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It does; it authorizes the sale either by the board or the President. As the Senator knows, most of the vessels that have been built were built under our emergency appropriation that was really given to the President, and the President was authorized to sell, requisition, and all that sort of thing; so that there is authority, under the law, for the sale of the ships. That is the law as it stands to-day.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well. I have assumed that it must be, because the chairman of the board states that the board has decided to sell them, and I have such a high opinion of Judge Payne as to convince me that he would not do anything that the law did not authorize him to do.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest desire to criticize the Shipping Board or the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and if I had I have not the knowledge of the facts to do it. I do not know that there is any basis for any criticism. All I know is that here is the assertion in the Washington Times of last evening, set out with considerable display and covering, I think, two pages of that paper, that it is the plan of the board to sell these ships, which certainly are a magnificent block of ships. It was stated in that paper that it was the largest and best single fleet of ships of its kind in the world and it was stated that it is the intention of the board to sell those ships. Now, in spite of the fact that under war emergency conditions we may have passed legislation which authorized the board to build, buy, and sell ships, a transaction of this magnitude, representing the acquisition of a great block of ships not in the ordinary course of business of the Shipping Board, which the legislation was passed to regulate, but as a result of the allied victory, presents to my mind at least a question that may fairly be considered a governmental question, and a governmental question of such a character as might well and not improperly be the subject of an expression of opinion by Congress, if it desires to express its views.

The board may be entirely right and events may show that it is the part of wisdom, in view of the state of the market and the condition of these vessels, to sell them if they can get a proper price, and it may be that their opinion is correct that passenger vessels, owing to our prohibition policy, can not be successfully maintained by this country in competition with the passenger vessels of other nations, although at least some of these vessels are not entirely passenger vessels, for I noticed the cargo capacity of many of them, as set forth in the Times last night, and it was tremendous. Having no information whatever in the premises, my only interest is that time should be secured, so that the Senate, through its Committee on Commerce, may investigate this matter in an orderly and thorough way and endeavor to ascertain the truth as to the intention of the board.

Of course, from the letter of Judge Payne it does not follow that the board intends to sell the vessels unless it can get a proper price for them. He does not state about that. The resolution offered by the Senator from Arizona, however, states in its preamble that whereas it is the intention of the board to

sell these ships for \$28,000,000 to the International Mercantile Marine Co., the board is instructed not to make a sale of any of them. That sets forth a distinct affirmative declaration of facts about which I have no knowledge, and I would like to ask the Senator whether he is sure of that preliminary statement in the preamble of the joint resolution.

Mr. ASHURST. I may be in error as to the fact that they propose to sell the ships to the International Mercantile Marine Co., but you will notice that the resolution says, "And its affiliated companies." I will concede I may be in error in that. I may be in error as to the price for which they are going to sell the ships. I concede that, and I would not consider it a reflection if I were in error as to the price, but I think the main features and substance of the joint resolution are correct in the main, that the Shipping Board is about to sell the ships for a ridiculously inadequate price and at an early date. I might have stated that in the resolution; I wish now that I had. I think we can all agree on the common ground that the ships are going to be sold at a ridiculously low price at an early date to the International Mercantile Marine Co. and its affiliated or associated companies.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The resolution as framed appears to be a final direction to the board. I am not certain that the Senate has the right to direct the board.

Mr. ASHURST. It is a joint resolution.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Unless Congress is prepared to modify or repeal the existing legislation. I am still not clear that we would have a right to direct a violation of the existing law, unless we intended to repeal the law. However that may be, I simply wish to express the hope that the Senate will adopt some resolution that will stay the hand of the Shipping Board until Congress can decide whether it is a question that it wants to take a hand in and determine as a governmental policy, and whether it desires to prescribe the conditions of the sale, if a sale should be agreed upon.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator has correctly stated all that I hope to accomplish. I have no doubt 25 or 50 Senators, perhaps all other Senators, could have drawn a better resolution, and I will accept any amendment that will be efficacious to the end in view.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish the attention of the Senator from Arizona, because I desire to submit an amendment. The Senator's resolution provides, among other things:

That neither the fleets of vessels nor any individual vessel taken by the United States from the Imperial German Government during the Great War shall be sold.

I want to strike out from there on and insert the following language instead:

Until specific authority is granted therefor by Congress.

Mr. ASHURST. I accept that amendment. I have that right?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; the Senator has that right.

Mr. ASHURST. Then I accept the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. As the Senator's resolution reads from there on, it says, "except to the highest bidder," and so forth. It does seem to me in a question of this magnitude, involving all these various valuable ships, no action ought to be taken until specific authority is given by Congress to take it. I realize that under the existing law the President through this board has authority, unless Congress enacts a different law, to make the sale. I do not wish to be understood as criticizing anybody for taking that position. To my mind it would seem to be a wrong step to take. It might be that upon investigation Congress would want to take that step, but I doubt it very much. Notwithstanding we have that law, if Congress should pass the joint resolution which the Senator from Arizona has introduced, as it is now modified by the amendment which I have suggested, it would in effect be an amendment of the law so far as these particular ships are concerned, and they could not be sold until authority was granted for their sale.

Mr. ASHURST. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. Of course, I drew my resolution with a view to getting some action, and the resolution simply directs the Shipping Board to stay the sale. I feel certain that if Congress would pass a resolution asking that the sale be suspended for three months the Shipping Board would respect it.

Mr. NORRIS. As a matter of law, they would have to suspend the sale. They would not have any authority if the joint resolution is passed by the Senate and the House and is signed by the President; it becomes a law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator believe that the joint resolution ought to be amended so as to include the ships that were built as well as those that we captured from Germany?

Mr. ASHURST. That would be agreeable to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I mean to put a limitation upon the tonnage—5,000 tons or something like that. I do not think the board ought to sell our great merchant marine without the approval of Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe it is a matter of sufficient importance for Congress to pass upon. It is one of the most important questions before the country to-day as to whether or not we are going to keep and maintain the merchant marine that we built up during the Great War. I do not think that the board ought to have the right to sell the great ships that we have built at great expense without the specific approval of Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with that sentiment entirely, although I presume Congress would have sufficient time to enact a law as to the other ships later. The emergency exists now, as I understand the Senator from Arizona, in regard to some specific ships that are named in the resolution. It is not contemplated to sell the other ships at the present time. So far as I am concerned I am willing to vote for an amendment that would apply to all ships the Government owns, but I would not want to endanger this resolution by putting in some other provision that would bring about a debate which would delay it, and probably these particular ships would be sold in the meantime.

Mr. ASHURST. If the resolution is to pass, it must pass before to-morrow night, and the more we put in it the more ground there is for objection. It is simply the ships we seized from Germany that we are trying to stop the sale of at an inadequate price. I do not consider that the question of Government ownership is at all involved. I have not touched that question. I have some definite views on that subject, but I have not touched it because we have not the time to debate it now.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I see in the newspapers that the Secretary of War made some protest against selling these German ships and expressed the hope that they might be retained, to which Judge Payne replied, calling attention to the fact that they were building ships for the purpose of transportation at Hog Island. The ships which the Shipping Board are building, as I understand it, and I think my information is correct, cost about \$200 to \$225 a ton. You can not run a ship profitably at that rate per ton. Every ship we build will be sold or leased at a loss, and yet we are going on building ships with the certainty of a dead loss on every one we build, at a time when we are talking about economy and retrenchment. I think the whole subject needs thorough inquiry and pretty drastic action. But this, as the Senator from Nebraska says, is an emergency case. We are selling these ships, I understand, at \$80 a ton and replacing them with ships that cost \$225 a ton.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is about correct in his figures.

Mr. NORRIS. Personally it seems to me that when we come to consider it we ought to consider whether it would not be advisable to enlarge the powers and activities of the Panama Railroad Co. that now owns some ships and leases some others. That is a corporation the stock of which is owned entirely by the Government of the United States.

It would be a very simple matter to lease these ships to a company like that, if we decide that is the right course to take, and they could be operated at whatever revenue they might bring.

I realize, or at least I believe, not being an expert, that we can not expect permanently to build ships at the present cost and operate them during the years that are to come and make a profit on them at that cost. It seems to me it would be foolish for the Government now to turn these ships over to some private company at a ridiculously low figure when, as other Senators have said, we might stand very much in need of them in the future, and would have to buy them back or build others at exorbitant prices. For the present, particularly since the committee is investigating it, we ought to ask the Shipping Board and those in charge to stay their hand, particularly as to these ships, until they can get specific authority for making the sale if it is decided later that they should make it. Personally I do not believe I would be in favor—I would have to be convinced if I did favor it—of selling the ships to anybody. But that question is not involved now; and whether we believe the Government ought to retain them, or whether we believe the Government ought to sell them, or whether we believe the Government ought to lease them either to the Panama Railroad Co. or some private corporation, or to some new governmental corporation, and have them operated by the Government—whether we have convictions on any of these various methods that might be resorted to, it seems to me that now we ought all to be united on the proposition that we can not afford to have them sold, as it is said they are about to be sold.

Mr. POMERENE. In any event, it does not appeal to the Senator from Nebraska as a good business proposition to sell these ships at \$80 a ton when it costs at least \$225 a ton to build new ships to take their places?

Mr. NORRIS. No, indeed.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, about this matter perhaps we had better start with an understanding of what the law is. The ships that are now under the control of the Shipping Board and being operated by the Shipping Board were built in pursuance of certain appropriation acts in connection with the shipping act. Those appropriation acts authorized the President to build ships, acquire ships, purchase ships, operate ships, and to dispose of ships. All those words, as I recall, are expressed in the act. The act goes on further to provide that the President may name certain agents to carry out and execute the law.

The President proceeded in pursuance of that authority to name the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation to build ships and proceeded to name as the agent for the operation of the ships the United States Shipping Board. Matters have been going on under that arrangement. The power to dispose of the ships is vested in the President in pursuance of those acts. It has seemed to me that was a mighty safe place to vest it. The authority, therefore, must come from the President to dispose of those ships or any ships. I do not know what order has been issued by the President, but certain it is, I take it, that the Shipping Board has passed certain resolutions outlining its policy, setting forth its views in connection with the handling of the ships, and has called on the President to make the order directing it to carry out that program. The President, I presume, has made that order and authorized the Shipping Board to dispose of the ships by sale under such regulations or conditions as the Shipping Board may see fit to impose. I presume that is the present status of the whole matter.

The real question is, What should be the policy of the Government with reference to these ships? Ought we to dispose of them or ought we to keep them? That involves also the general policy whether the Government ought to quit building ships entirely; that it should just go on and complete those already under contract and complete its present program and go out of the business entirely of constructing ships and repairing ships, and that sort of thing; and whether the Government should also go out of the business of owning, chartering, or operating ships and sell and dispose of all the ships which they have acquired by seizure, commandeering, purchase, construction, or otherwise. Those questions are involved in certain bills which have been introduced. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has introduced several. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] has introduced a bill. There is a bill before the committee coming from the House, and there are certain resolutions pending before the committee. The committee has been giving hearings, as the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], has stated, with a view to making a report recommending what shall be the policy of the Government with reference to the building of ships, the owning, chartering, leasing, or the operation of ships, and the disposition of ships. That report we expect to produce within a reasonable time.

I will say that I introduced a resolution on June 30, 1919, Senate resolution No. 92, to this effect:

Resolved, That in the judgment of the Senate it is not advisable for the United States Shipping Board to sell at this time any of the merchant ships of the Government to foreign interests unless it be such as can not be successfully employed here.

There was a rumor then that sales were being made to anybody who might offer to buy any of the ships. The resolution went on:

Resolved further, That efficient merchant ships of the Government should not be sold at all at this time, except such ships as are undesirable for overseas trade and will bring approaching their actual cost or more, and then only with a view of replacing them with better ships and in order to properly balance the fleet.

That resolution was introduced by me in the Senate June 30, 1919, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, and it is before that committee now. I urged action and made some remarks about it at the time, and later, on October 17, which later appear in the RECORD at page 7062, there appears also a communication from the chairman of the Shipping Board and a list of the ships they had already sold, including steel vessels to the number of 26; wood and composite vessels, 20, of a dead-weight tonnage of 84,879; tugs, 5; and barges, 1. The total dead-weight tonnage of all those ships was 217,207, and \$10,546,783.26 appears to have been the purchase price for those ships already sold, and some of the ships were of a tonnage of 7,462, 8,453, 9,778, 7,455, and so forth, but most of them were small vessels.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Was not the Senator able to get any action on his resolution?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; no action has been taken, because, in the first place, my understanding has been that the Shipping Board had not decided upon the policy of disposing of the ships; that they were rather waiting for action by Congress to determine what course they should pursue. In fact, they said to us that they were open-minded about it; that they had not concluded that they ought to dispose of those ships or to cease operating the ships. They said they would leave that question to Congress to settle, and I thought matters were rather in statu quo with reference to that policy until the hearings were concluded. We have been expecting to call the Shipping Board before us, but they have asked that others should be heard first and then they will come and give their views. I have never understood that there was a definite policy determined upon by the Shipping Board.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator understands that if they sell these vessels that is the beginning of some policy?

Mr. FLETCHER. It seems to me so, and it seems to me that the only theory upon which this sort of sale can be based at all is the theory that the Shipping Board favors the Government going entirely out of the business, both the building and the operating and owning of ships. I do not agree with that policy.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator's resolution, however, only applies to sales to foreigners?

Mr. FLETCHER. The first part of it did, but the second part referred to all ships.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. May I ask the Senator, in view of his statement that the Shipping Board have never informed the Committee on Commerce of any plan of theirs or recommendation as to our policy in respect to the shipping question, does he not think it is wise for us to stay the sale of these ships, if possible, until a policy can be formulated after due consideration?

Mr. FLETCHER. I was just proceeding to say that. Last October, at the time I made those observations with reference to that resolution, I said:

I am not in favor of disposing of any of these ships at this time, except such as are not efficient and might reasonably be disposed of in order to balance the fleet. If it was left with me, I would not sell a rowboat, especially not to any other country.

That is my position to-day.

Mr. ASHURST. I heard the Senator's able speech, and I was impressed with it at the time. I heard the Clerk read his resolution in the Senate, and I gave it a great deal of reflection. A large part of the action I have taken this morning was predicated directly upon the courageous, the timely, and the statesmanlike action of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] last June.

The seed he has sown has germinated, at least, and he is on the right track. I hope and know he will continue to lend his powerful and able support to the suggestion that we shall not dispose of these ships, at least until we determine what the governmental policy may be.

I will say further, if the Senator will allow me, that I am not this morning talking Government ownership; that is a wide field that might be discussed later; but we ought not to foreclose it by permitting the ships to be sold. I may or may not favor it; but we are not talking Government ownership; we are talking about having an opportunity to discuss the question.

Mr. FLETCHER. I agree with the Senator that we have not yet reached the point where we are seriously to consider the definite, fixed policy of the Government with regard to Government ownership and operation of ships. We must first establish a decent—I might say an adequate—American merchant marine. A merchant marine is not established by having a number of ships built. Those ships have got to be in use. The object should be to open the routes of trade; to put the ships through those routes and through the lanes of the sea in such a way as will meet the needs of American commerce. To do that requires a little time. We can not simply get the ships together and say we have a merchant marine. We must put them in the routes of trade and have the lines and schedules established and operated in such a way as will serve the producers, the industries, and the trade of the United States. When that is done we shall have our merchant marine established. We can then determine whether or not the Government shall dispose of its ships upon certain terms and conditions. I agree fully that the terms and conditions set forth in Judge Payne's letter should be included in every instance—first, that the ships must fly the American flag; and, second, that they must be used on the routes designated by the Shipping Board.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. How soon does the Senator think that the Committee on Commerce can submit to the Senate its definite views of a policy?

Mr. FLETCHER. It would be, of course, a little difficult to answer that, but I think the committee have very nearly completed the hearings. The chairman of the committee can probably tell better than I can about that, but I should not think the hearings ought to last more than a week or so longer. Probably in two weeks we may be able to conclude the hearings.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope that the committee will get through with the hearings next week, anyway; but I desire to say that so far as determining the policy which shall be pursued is concerned, it involves a tremendous problem. I do not think the committee probably will be able to report in a week.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should not think so. I stated we might probably finish the hearings in a couple of weeks.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to ask the Senator from Florida one other question, and I shall also be glad to have the opinion of the Senator from Washington. In the meantime, is it the Senator's opinion that action should be taken which will prevent the sale of these ships until after the Committee on Commerce shall have reached a conclusion and Congress shall have acted?

Mr. SIMMONS. To what sale does the Senator from Georgia refer?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I refer to the proposed sale of these ships next week.

Mr. FLETCHER. With regard to that, my view is that it would be a serious mistake to sell those ships. I think we ought to hold them, unless there may be some of them that are in bad condition and which are not serviceable or efficient ships, for which we might get a good price and which, for certain reasons, purchasers might desire to acquire.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But as to the whole number of ships, the Senator is opposed to the sale?

Mr. FLETCHER. I am utterly opposed to that; I think it would be a serious mistake. I do not think five years will be too long for us to figure on as a time when we shall determine the policy of the Government as to whether or not it will permanently operate and own the ships.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has been studying this question for years and is familiar with present conditions in regard to shipbuilding up to date. In the Senator's judgment, what does it cost the Shipping Board per ton to build a new ship?

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, to build passenger ships costs much more than to build cargo ships.

Mr. POMERENE. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. It costs now from \$200 to \$215 a ton, perhaps a little less than that in some instances, to build cargo ships.

Mr. POMERENE. To what kind of ships does the Senator from Florida refer?

Mr. FLETCHER. To dead-weight tons and cargo ships.

Mr. POMERENE. What does it cost to build passenger ships?

Mr. FLETCHER. That would depend on the furnishings, finishings, and accommodations which are put into them. Those may be as elaborate as is desired, and it may cost as much as \$400 a ton to build a passenger ship equipped in the luxurious way in which passenger ships were equipped before the war at least.

Mr. POMERENE. It would cost at least \$400 a ton to duplicate the passenger ships which it is now proposed to sell for \$80 per ton?

Mr. ASHURST. They are not all passenger ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. They are not all passenger ships, and they are not all new ships. In fact, most of them are from 10 to 15 years old, it may be.

The point raised by the chairman of the Shipping Board in his letter that it would cost some fifty-seven million dollars to recondition these ships as a reason why the board felt they had better dispose of them, it seems to me, is not well taken. In the first place, it ought not to cost anything approaching that amount to recondition these ships, and I believe the reconditioning of them could be done in the Government yards at a very much less figure than that. The people who put those figures before the Shipping Board were, in my judgment, making a profiteering proposal. It should not cost half that amount to put the ships in condition.

Mr. POMERENE. In any event the wisdom or unwisdom of reconditioning the ships should depend upon the policy which the Government will adopt in the future.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely.

Mr. RANDELL. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will.

Mr. RANDELL. I desire to ask the Senator if these figures of \$57,000,000 for reconditioning the ships are correct, does not that amount to about \$160 per ton in addition to the \$80 per ton for which it is proposed to sell them?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have not figured it out.

Mr. RANDELL. I have figured it out, and it is a little over \$160 per ton, which they say it would cost to recondition them. If that be true, and they should succeed in selling the ships before reconditioning them at \$80 per ton, it would, in substance, be selling them for \$240 per ton instead of \$80, as many Senators have suggested. I am not urging the point at all, but I say if the Shipping Board is right in that respect, then it is going to cost a great deal to put these ships in shape.

Mr. FLETCHER. I see the Senator's point, and, of course, it is well taken. These ships are not in first-class condition; there has got to be some money spent on all of them, in some cases involving pretty expensive repairs. However, I am making the point, in the first place, that it ought not to cost any such sum as \$57,000,000 to do that, and I do not believe it would cost that amount if the matter were properly managed. In the next place, I think even then, if the ships are put in condition, the price asked, according to the figures given, is exceedingly low. They are worth more money than that.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I simply desire to say that it seems to me in this discussion the fundamental questions involved are entirely overlooked. The question is whether we are to adopt a nautical Plumb plan for our shipping; the question is whether the Government is to continue to operate the ships or to turn them over into the hands of private enterprise, of American citizens, to sail under the American flag.

Now, what are the conditions? We have upward of 10,000,000 tons of shipping built or under construction, and we will have that amount of tonnage in a short time. What shall we do with all of that shipping? Shall the Government adopt a Plumb nautical plan and continue to operate those ships or shall we turn them over to private American citizens and let them operate them, as we hope to do in the future in the case of our railroads?

What are these German ships? A large share of them were passenger ships. They were remodeled during the war and made into troop ships. To make them useful again for passenger ships they must be again remodeled. Nearly all of the ships constructed by the Emergency Fleet Corporation were freight vessels and not passenger vessels.

The question now is, Shall passenger routes be established between this country and England and between ports of South America and the United States and shall our Government engage in that business? The Cunard Line and other British lines are now preparing and getting ready to build a number of passenger vessels to regain their command of the trans-Atlantic trade, as they commanded it before the war. With the exception, perhaps, of the Old American Line, we have, so far as I know, no passenger liners; we have no trans-Atlantic passenger lines at present; and the question is, Shall we enter into that field of competition and operate American passenger lines between America and the Old World and between our country and South America?

On top of that there arises the question, Shall the Government undertake this business or shall we put it into the hands of private American citizens and allow them to conduct the business? That is the question involved in this case.

I am saying nothing about the price of the vessels; I am not defending anybody; I am accusing nobody; I am simply calling attention to the fundamental question involved here, which is, Shall the Federal Government undertake to operate passenger lines across the Atlantic and to South America or shall we leave such business to private American enterprise? It is analogous, Mr. President, in many respects to the problem that has confronted the railroad committees of Congress; it is a question of whether or not we shall adopt a nautical Plumb plan.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, as I stated at the outset, the main question is, What is going to be the policy of the Government? My position is that we have not reached the point where we are in a condition to determine that policy. We do need passenger ships in connection with the cargo ships; for instance, in the trade with the South American ports of Rio Janeiro and Buenos Aires. The people of South America go to Europe because they can cross by four or five different lines in 15 days. They can sail from Rio Janeiro to Genoa or from Rio Janeiro to English ports in about 15 days on the best kind of passenger ships, and the result is they go to Europe and they trade with

Europe. I do not know of a passenger line affording proper accommodations between the United States and South American ports, and the time required for the voyage is about four weeks.

We need passenger lines as well as cargo lines. The one supplements and cooperates with the other. We need to balance our fleet; we can not have an adequate merchant marine based entirely on cargo ships, but, in my judgment, we need some passenger vessels. The Shipping Board has been discussing for some time past whether or not they would build passenger ships. In fact, they are now building 26 ships for passenger business. The ships they have heretofore built are cargo vessels; and right now, when they have some passenger ships, they can put them on these routes without interfering at all with private lines. There is no need of interfering with private lines in the trans-Atlantic trade, but we do need passenger ships in connection with our cargo ships if we are going to do business with our friends, especially in South America.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to say a word to the esteemed and learned Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], who has made a very pertinent suggestion. I assure him that when I drafted the joint resolution which I have presented and when I argued for it I did not have in mind, and I do not now have in mind, any such plan as a nautical Plumb plan. Indeed, Mr. President, the Senator will remember that I distinctly stated that the question of Government ownership could not be involved here and ought not to be involved here. I assume that Senators, if any of them vote for the joint resolution, will not be committed directly or indirectly to any Government-ownership plan.

I repeat that the joint resolution does not commit anyone to a nautical Plumb plan or a Government-ownership plan; it simply stays the sale until we can determine what kind of a plan we do want. I want the Senator from Minnesota to feel assured that I am not trying by any covert means or any indirect means to commit this Congress to any nautical Plumb plan.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to say to the Senator, although I do not know who has the floor—

Mr. ASHURST. I have not.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have the floor, and I have yielded to Senators. I should like to finish as soon as I can, but I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I simply wish to say to the Senator from Arizona, as supplemental to what I have heretofore said, that nearly all of the vessels the Emergency Fleet Corporation constructed during the war were freighters. The only passenger vessels we have that we could immediately put into use would be the German liners which we took during the war. They were converted into transports; they ought now to be converted into passenger vessels, and I think it urgent that they should be put into passenger lines in order that we may have American passenger lines between our country and Europe and between our country and South America. To my mind the only question is whether those passenger lines shall be operated and controlled by the Government or by private American enterprise and private American citizens.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for just a moment for a suggestion?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Arizona and to the Senate that the joint resolution be amended by striking out in the first clause the words "on February 16, 1920, to the International Mercantile Marine Co. and its affiliated companies," and then strike out the second "whereas" entirely. Then there will remain a resolution which will merely prohibit the sale of the ships until the Senate and the House of Representatives can look into the matter. All of the other questions will be irrelevant; we will have stopped the sale, and that is all that is necessary to be done now until Congress looks into the matter further. I hope the Senator from Arizona will agree to that suggestion and let the amendment be made.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield—

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. Understanding I have a right to do so, I accept the amendment suggested by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I understand this is a joint resolution.

Mr. ASHURST. It is a joint resolution.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then it should go to a committee, of course.

Mr. ASHURST. I was going to ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of a joint resolution on its introduction? Such a resolution is the same as a bill and it should

be referred to a committee. I should not consent to the passage of the joint resolution by unanimous consent, although I may not be opposed to it when it is looked into; but it is a joint resolution, similar in nature to a bill, and it is really contrary to the practice of the Senate to pass a bill upon its mere presentation.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment of the joint resolution, and, if it is agreed to, I am perfectly willing that it may take that shape now, and then I will proceed with a few more words with regard to the policy.

I am perfectly willing to concede that now is a splendid time to sell ships. I agree with Judge Payne fully upon that point, that if we are going to dispose of these ships speedily and with a view to getting them into private hands as soon as possible and having the Government hasten its relinquishment of all activities in connection with shipping and the establishment of a mercantile marine, perhaps it is best to do so now, because the prices are good; but why not let the Government, while the prices are so good, hold on to a very good property? The people's money went into these ships—not these particular German ships, but into the merchant marine that we have. The proceeds of Liberty bonds are invested in these ships. The people of this country own them. Now, the rates are high. We can get back some of the extra cost that we put into these ships if we will operate them aright, and the board are operating them, I think, successfully. They have made a lot of mistakes. There is no doubt about that. They have had some difficulties; but still the ships are valuable and are earning money and, of course, the price is good now; but the fact that the price happens to be good is no reason why the Government should sell the ships. In my judgment the price is going to be good for years to come.

The British lost 12,000,000 tons of shipping during the war. They have built only about 2,500,000 tons per annum. That is about all they can build. Japan can not build over 400,000 tons a year. France can not build more than 500,000 tons a year. It is going to take time to restore the world's tonnage to the point at which it was in 1914, and during this time the freight rates are going to be high, and there is going to be demand for ships, and there is going to be profit in shipping. There is no question about that. Why should the Government just at this time, with these opportunities before it and in the presence of these necessities of the country as far as our foreign commerce is concerned, relinquish absolutely and entirely its control of shipping?

Mr. President, I just want to call attention for a moment to the importance of an adequate merchant marine. Of course, it is not necessary to argue that. You may say that we are not disposing of our merchant marine when we sell the ships to American owners to be operated under our flag, and all that sort of thing. You may find, the first thing you know, that foreign shipping interests will be behind many of these transactions, and you may find after a while that only half a dozen lines will have control of our shipping, and that, as I say, foreign interests are really behind those lines. There is a danger there.

Here is a document that I had printed, No. 335, entitled "The Problem of British Shipping," by Sidney Brooks, one of the distinguished authorities of England, and I desire to call your attention to what he has said on this subject:

It is a commonplace to remark that without the mercantile marine we could not have waged the war, much less won it. Everyone can now see that tonnage has been the basis of the whole allied effort. But we were almost criminally late in recognizing this simple, quintessential fact, and in shaping our policy accordingly. The war had been going on certainly for two years—in my own opinion, for two and a half years—before the nation and its rulers had begun to realize that we are not a continental but an insular power, drawing our life from the sea. So little was this foreseen or suspected at the beginning of the war that we took men from the shipyards by thousands and tens of thousands into the army and the munition factories, and practically shut down on the building of merchant vessels. Then gradually and protestingly we awoke to the reality of the U-boat depredations. We found that just at a time when our factories were demanding more and more material from abroad and our armies were requiring unprecedented quantities of imported foodstuffs, and our allies were asking for the loan of ships and yet more ships, and half of our total tonnage had to be diverted from commercial to military uses, the German submarines were making inroads on our depleted shipping with a success that, if it could be maintained, would eventually end in paralyzing our fighting arm. There were weeks, there were months, in 1917, when the enemy's campaign seemed so likely to triumph that one could almost name the date when Great Britain's part in the war would be over. Sir L. Cholzka Money stated in the House of Commons on the 14th of November that had our losses in the month of April, 1917, been maintained we should have been "in deadly danger" in six months and "ruined" in nine months. I wonder how many people realize that in the first nine months of last year we lost almost a sixth of the entire mercantile marine with which we began the war, and that our output of vessels for the whole year was about 240,000 tons less than our losses during a single quarter. Our strength at sea was being steadily sapped, even though the fleet remained intact and supreme.

Such a paradoxical conjuncture of affairs would have seemed unimaginable before the war. But then before the war we really did not

know the meaning of sea power. We thought it meant dreadnoughts, cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and so on. We did not realize that it also meant liners, trawlers, tankers, tramps, and the ordinary merchant vessel. We did not grasp that while the fleets represented the striking and protecting half of sea power the carrying and supplying half consisted of the merchant marine, and that both were equally vital to the success of our military effort.

That is the statement made by this Englishman upon this subject, which it seems to me furnishes all that need be said to show that we will be derelict in our duty, we will be recreant to our trust, if we do not see, now that the United States has at last taken its place upon the seas and has realized at last the sea power that should be ours, that never again shall we be in the position, as we were in 1914, of being dependent upon foreign ships to carry our commerce, and never again shall we be in a helpless condition in case of trouble, as this article shows we will be unless we have merchant ships as well as an aggregation of floating batteries on the seas.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber when the resolution introduced by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] was read; but I understand, from a colloquy between him and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], that the general purpose of this joint resolution is to stay the hand of the Shipping Board in the matter of the sale of these ships until the Government can settle upon some policy with reference to them.

I am heartily in favor of the joint resolution. I have listened with great interest to the presentation of this matter by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], and I agree with the Senator in toto in the general statement that if we are ever to have an American merchant marine, now is the time for its establishment, and its establishment through the Government, because if the Government does not give us an American merchant marine we are not likely to have one.

Mr. President, of course, in the last analysis, Congress must decide what policy shall be pursued with reference to the ships that we now have. We must determine whether we want to retain them in Government ownership or to transfer them to private ownership. We are in danger right now of having that question settled for us by the Shipping Board instead of by the Congress of the United States. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] had referred to the analogy between this matter and the railroad matter. There is some analogy at some points. There is at other points no analogy; but with reference to the policy of the Government with regard to railroads, we did not permit the Director General of Railroads to decide that policy for us. The Congress itself, after due consideration, will decide that question. Unless something is done right now by the Congress, before the Congress acts the Shipping Board will have decided this question for us, and our action in the matter will be of but little importance.

For some time the Shipping Board has been selling off ships, and now it is proposed by the Shipping Board to sell the 30 big ships that we acquired from the Germans, the only passenger vessels that are now a part of our fleet. The Senator from Minnesota makes a very good point when he says that we need to balance this fleet, and have some passenger-carrying ships as well as some cargo-carrying ships. Now, if these ships are permitted to be sold before we have decided upon this policy, they will have sold off every passenger ship of which the Government is now in control.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator there. I will name just one ship that is proposed to be sold. There are others.

Mr. SIMMONS. The *Leviathan*?

Mr. ASHURST. The *Leviathan* is the largest ship, 54,000 tons. She, however, is not now equipped as a passenger ship; but listen to this:

The *Kaiser Wilhelm II*, Americanized now as the *Agamemnon*, has a tonnage of 19,360 tons and a passenger capacity of 2,400 persons. She is purely a passenger ship, having no cargo space, and she is one of the most, if not the most, gorgeously equipped vessels afloat, providing every modern comfort and convenience. That is only one of them.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] says that we must have passenger ships, and I think he is right about it. I think we will all agree that he is right about it. Yet we are sitting here inactive in the face of a proposition of the Shipping Board to dispose of every passenger ship that the Government now controls. The Senator says he wants the Congress to decide that question. How can the Congress decide the question as to the sale of these passenger ships if it remains silent until the passenger ships go into other hands?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again? Take the *President Grant*, which, of course, retained her patriotic name after we took her from the Germans. She has a tonnage of 18,172 tons. She has the greatest passenger-carry-

ing capacity of the whole fleet. She accommodates 3,300 persons, is a superbly and beautifully equipped ship, and she is in the melting pot. She is to be sold with the rest. Two of them I have named. I will name some more.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. Just a moment, Mr. President. If the Government shall ever part with these ships when we have decided that it is good public policy to turn them over to private ownership, the Government, I take it, would never do that without making adequate provision that they shall remain under the American flag. The Government would never do that without making adequate provision for the reconversion of those ships as auxiliary cruisers whenever the Government might have need for them for that purpose; and yet if this process of gradual disintegration of the little merchant marine that we have built up here during the war is permitted to go on, these ships will leave the Government without any binding condition with reference to whether they are hereafter to fly the American flag, and without any condition that the Government may at any time commandeer them and see that they are at all times kept in condition to be easily converted to the uses of the Navy.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wanted to ask the Senator from Arizona a question while he was on his feet.

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator yield to me to reply?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. Did I understand the Senator from Arizona, in his statement this morning, to state that England had offered \$125 a ton for these ships?

Mr. ASHURST. I was reliably informed—of course, I do not want to be set down as having stated an untruth—I was reliably informed by representative men who assume to have knowledge that England had offered or would offer \$125 per ton for these ships. Now, I may be wrong, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, I have no doubt that they would be glad to give \$125 a ton for the ships; but it did seem to me strange that America was thinking of selling ships to England, even at \$125 per ton, and England was thinking of buying those ships when she can not even pay the interest upon her debts to the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. It is an English company.

Mr. ASHURST. But if she had these ships she would not only be able to pay the interest but she could soon pay the principal from the profits that these great ships would bring her. I will leave it to the Senator from Florida, who is a very great expert on the subject. She would easily be able to pay the interest from the earnings of this fleet.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think it would be very good business sense for the United States at this time to sell 350,000 tons of shipping to England at \$125 a ton, and expect payment for those ships, when England now can not, or at least does not, pay the interest upon the bonds that she already owes the United States Government.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I inquire if the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has objected to the immediate consideration of this resolution?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I said that I should insist on its going to the committee. It is a joint resolution, not a simple resolution.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then that constitutes an objection to the immediate consideration of the measure, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not think I can be taken off the floor in this way. I have the floor. I have not yielded to the Senator for the purpose of summarily disposing of this matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have not tried to take the Senator off the floor. I made a parliamentary inquiry, so that we would understand what the situation was. I merely wanted to say that there is but five minutes left of the morning hour; and as the Senate can not act on this matter to-day, or at least until it is referred to the committee, on account of the objection of the Senator from Washington, I hoped that the regular order might be resumed; but of course I do not want to take the Senator off his feet.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I have but a few more observations to make.

I am thoroughly convinced that if we are to have, within our day and generation, an adequate merchant marine, we will have, through the instrumentality of the Government, to establish that merchant marine right now. The Government has a large

number of ships compared with what it had before the war, but we have nothing like an adequate merchant marine. We have not sufficient cargo ships to entitle us to claim a position as one of the great merchant-marine powers of the world. We have not enough cargo ships of that kind, and we have no passenger ships to speak of, such as are required in a well-balanced merchant marine. When we have finished building the 10,000,000 tons that the Senator has spoken of, we will have still an inadequate merchant marine. Now, my theory is that the Government of the United States is in a capital position just at this time to complete this merchant marine. It is in a magnificent position to complete this great merchant marine, to build and commission enough cargo ships and enough passenger ships to make a well-balanced, well-rounded merchant marine, worthy of the greatest Nation upon the earth. We can do that now more economically than it can be done by private individuals, because at great cost during the war we established the great plants in which these ships are being built. We own those plants. The International Mercantile Marine, which is the concern that wants to buy these 30 German ships, is a corporation that now, I understand, operates a part of its ships under foreign flags. They are the gentlemen who want to buy these ships. Do they desire to buy any of these costly plants that the Government created during the war for the construction of ships? No. Other gentlemen have gone to the Shipping Board and have made propositions to purchase ships. Has a single one of them offered to buy any of the plants that the Government erected during the war at a cost of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars? Not one of them. Does anyone in this Chamber believe that if the Shipping Board is permitted to carry out the present policy of doling these ships out to this corporation and that corporation it will buy plants and go on building ships until it has built an adequate merchant marine to meet the requirements of this great Nation? Is there any evidence in any of these propositions, or any evidence in any of the positions now being taken by the people who want to buy the ships, that it is their purpose to complete the American merchant marine; that it is their purpose to build the great passenger ships that we need; that it is their purpose to build additional cargo ships? Have they even offered to buy any of the facilities which the Government now possesses for the construction of these ships?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the joint resolution goes to the Committee on Commerce, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 1699. The Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the purpose I have in making this argument is that if these ships are sold in the way they are now being sold by the board to private individuals, then the great plants which the Government has built are going to be junked, shipbuilding in this country is going to come to an end, many of the ships that have already been built will go under a foreign flag, and at the end we will find that with all the expenditure of money and all this talk about the establishment of an American merchant marine our merchant marine will have disappeared and we shall have none.

Under those conditions it does seem to me that the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] has made a wise suggestion. Let us go on, Mr. President, in the construction of these ships. We have the plants, we have the equipment, we are able to build them cheaply. It is certain that we will build them if we determine upon that course, and in a short time we will have an adequate merchant marine. If we decide now to turn these ships over, we will find in a short time that we will have no merchant marine. We will be right back where we were before. The gentlemen who buy the ships will be coming here and saying we can not operate them under the American flag in competition with foreign Governments unless you give us a subsidy and put us in a condition to operate them under the American flag.

Let us go on and build up a great American merchant marine and balance it, and then when we have done that we will take this question up, just like we took up the railroad question, and we will decide whether we will operate the merchant marine by the Government or whether we will permit it under certain conditions framed, intended, and calculated to keep the merchant marine in the hands of Americans and under the American flag and subject to such subsidiary uses as the Government of the United States from time to time may require. In that way we will get a merchant marine; but, Mr. President, there is no other way. Preliminarily we may have an opportunity to decide it in case we determine that we will build no more ships; permanently in case we determine that we will build enough to complete our merchant marine. But, Mr. President, it is certain that with the policy now being pursued

by the Shipping Board, cautiously pursued, first one little sale here and then another little sale yonder, and then, getting a little holder, a bigger sale, as now proposed, if we remain silent here it will not be long before the thing will be decided for us without any voice in the matter at all.

I think, therefore, ordinary precaution requires that the resolution offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] should be passed, and that the Shipping Board should be given to understand that they are not to dispose of any more of these ships until they have secured the consent of the Congress.

I yield to no man in my desire to establish a merchant marine in this country. I have stood upon the floor of this Chamber and advocated it for the last seven or eight years. I think it is a consummation greatly to be desired. I did not years ago believe that such an opportunity as now exists for the establishment of an adequate merchant marine would come in my day; but it has come, and it seems to me that we are about to throw overboard and disregard the opportunity which is now presented to us. It would be a crime, Mr. President, to permit these ships to go into private hands unless we are assured by contracts that are binding that shipbuilding in this country is not to stop now, that shipbuilding in this country is to go on until we have an adequate merchant marine, and when we have an adequate merchant marine under the American flag it is not by hocus-pocus to be dissipated and become in a few years a marine controlled and directed under another flag.

I trust that the joint resolution will be passed.

RETURN OF RESIDENT POLES.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution, which I am instructed to introduce by the Committee on Military Affairs, and following its presentation to report it to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). The joint resolution will be read at length.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) authorizing the Secretary of War to bring back on Army transports from Danzig, Poland, residents of the United States of Polish origin who were engaged in the war on the side of the allied and associated powers, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas there are now in concentration camps at or near Warsaw, Poland, and have been since November, 1919, upward of 12,000 residents of the United States of Polish origin, who were equipped and transported at the expense of Great Britain and France from the United States to Poland, and who were engaged in active service in behalf of the allied cause during the war; and

Whereas they are desirous of returning to their homes in this country and are without means to accomplish such repatriation: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That authority be, and hereby is, given to the Secretary of War to use such Army transports as may be available to bring back to the United States from Danzig, Poland, such residents of the United States of Polish origin as were engaged in the war on the side of the allied and associated powers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I desire to discuss it briefly, and I am glad the Senator has asked unanimous consent for its present consideration. Of course, the joint resolution which I introduced has gone to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The resolution of the Senator from New York has not been agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. It is the pending business, but my remarks on that resolution will be an unreturning parable. I do not expect to touch it or go near it, for I am talking about another subject.

The chairman of the committee, my distinguished friend, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], objected to the present consideration of the joint resolution I introduced. That is his right. I have no criticism; he would be justified in being offended if I intended a criticism, but I want him to know what is the result of his action. Judge Payne has telephoned within the last 20 minutes to a Senator that he is going to sell the ships on Monday, February 16, as the preamble to my resolution stated. That means that should the Committee on Commerce be convened to-day and report the resolution favorably, one objection to-morrow will kill the resolution.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator has just stated that these ships would be sold on Monday.

Mr. ASHURST. A Senator just told me that he talked with Mr. Payne 20 minutes ago, and Mr. Payne stated they would be sold on Monday.

Mr. POMERENE. What reason is urged for this urgency sale under the circumstances?

Mr. ASHURST. I do not know.

Mr. POMERENE. We will all be interested in knowing.

Mr. ASHURST. I hope Senators will pardon me for taking the time I did, but I felt that I ought to say a word. The result of the objection is to put it in the power of one Senator to-morrow to stop action on the joint resolution.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. May I make a suggestion to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Why does not the Senator propose his resolution in the form of a Senate resolution requesting that the sale be not made until the consent of Congress is given?

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator. I believe that is a wise suggestion, and I ask unanimous consent to do it when the Senator from New York has disposed of his resolution.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether he thinks there is anything in the pending joint resolution that would infringe any immigration law?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, Mr. President. These soldiers were residents of the United States. I may say to the Senator that during the war, after our participation in it commenced, representatives of the embryo Polish government came to this country, and with the permission of the Government of the United States recruited something like 12,000 men for the so-called Polish Legion. These were men of Polish origin residing in the United States. A large number of them were citizens of the United States, and quite another portion of them had taken out their first papers. The British and French Governments transported them to France; the French Government uniformed and equipped them and organized them into the Polish Legion attached to the French Army. The Polish Legion, largely made up of American citizens of Polish origin, fought with the French Army during the last year of the war, and at the time of the armistice were sent to Poland, and since then have been in the Polish Army under Gen. Haller.

Recently those men have been discharged from the Polish Army and are living in a great concentration camp outside the city of Warsaw, unable to return to the United States. The War Department is operating a transport service between the United States and Antwerp for the service of our troops on the Rhine, and the Secretary of War informs me that it will be quite easy for the transports to proceed to Danzig, load these men, and bring them back to the United States, where they went from a few years ago.

Mr. KING. It seems to me, under the explanation made by the Senator, that the joint resolution ought to be very promptly passed.

Mr. MCKELLAR. May I inquire of the Senator from New York about how many of them there are now and about what will be the cost of the transportation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Secretary of War informed me this morning that the appropriations are ample to cover this expense. The only thing that will materially increase the cost of operating the transports is the subsistence of these men while they are being brought home. I understand that Polish-American societies will be ready to see that they reach their homes all over the United States as soon as they arrive at either New York or Boston.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I understand the Senator to state that a large number of these men are already American citizens?

Mr. WADSWORTH. A large number of them are American citizens.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The joint resolution ought to be passed by all means.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF SHIPS.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about the joint resolution which was introduced by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and I deem it proper to say them now.

This is one of the most important questions that is going to come before Congress at this or any other session. The question of transportation is one of supreme importance. We have had much difficulty about the solution of the railroad transportation question and we are seeming to have much difficulty about the

question of sea transportation. The time is quite ripe now when we ought to settle what the Government policy is going to be about the establishment of an American merchant marine.

I sent out last fall this sort of a statement to all my constituents:

An American merchant marine should also be established and maintained, and the Government should continue to build ships and to operate all constructed in carrying our coastwise and foreign commerce. No more Government-built ships adapted to such use should be sold or disposed of.

The Committee on Commerce is trying to determine now upon a recommendation for a policy to be established along this line. They have been having hearings for some time. They are almost ready to come to a conclusion about what they think the Government policy should be hereafter. Before that can be done it is proposed to sell this great fleet, and we have been selling ships that have been constructed at Government expense in Government yards. Why? Because somebody wanted to buy them and because the Shipping Board thought it was good policy to dispose of them. If we are ever to have an American merchant marine now is the time that policy must be determined upon. The Government might be induced, perhaps, to go into ship-building at some other time in the history of the country, but it could never be done except under an emergency. We had to build ships while the war was going on. We prepared to build these ships, we made great yards, and we are turning out Government ships, Government owned.

There is a vast difference between the railroad problem and this American merchant marine problem. We did not own the railroads; we do not own the railroads now; and the only question is whether they shall be turned back to their owners. But we have built the ships and we own the ships and we have need for an American merchant marine. That is the condition now. If we shall wait to determine a policy about what shall be done hereafter until the Shipping Board has sold all the ships we acquired from Germany and has sold the ships we built in our own yards at public expense, there will never be a question of the Government establishing an American merchant marine.

Now is the time that this matter ought to be settled and finally disposed of. We know the necessity for ships. We know that no great Government engaged in commerce can live unless it shall have sea transportation facilities. We understood that; it was impressed upon us in the Great War. We have the ships, we have the plants, we have the ability, and the ocean is free to us all and does not need any repairs. This is the time when we must determine whether we shall hereafter engage in commerce upon the sea or whether we shall take care of our own industrial conditions, as must be done even if the Government shall be required to continue in the building of ships and the operation of those already built.

When the last appropriation bill was here providing appropriation for the Shipping Board I introduced an amendment saying that hereafter no more Government-built or Government-owned ships shall be sold, but the Shipping Board shall continue to build them and they shall be operated for the benefit of the Government in carrying the coastwise and foreign commerce under regulations made by the Shipping Board. That amendment was not germane at the time and it was objected to and went out on a point of order. Because it was offered to a general appropriation bill it went out; but the question now confronts us; and if all the Government ships are disposed of before we can determine whether there shall be a policy or not, there is no use to have a policy. Now is the time to determine this question. The necessity was never greater. We are talking about compulsory military training for the Army; we are talking about the great questions of preparedness; but, Mr. President, I desire to say here and now the inevitable conflict for control and supremacy on the sea will be waged within the next 50 years. The American people want to be ready for it and the American people must have a merchant marine. There is one already established now, and it should not be disposed of.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will yield for just a moment, I was under the impression that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] had reoffered his resolution.

Mr. ASHURST. I am getting it ready. It will be introduced in about a minute.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce and to have immediate consideration for the resolution which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the resolution be first read. Then the Chair will ask if there is objection.

The Assistant Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 305), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the United States Shipping Board be, and it is hereby, requested to defer the selling of vessels taken over by the United States from the Imperial German Government during the war until further action by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the introduction of the resolution?

Mr. JONES of Washington. As the chairman of the Shipping Board is going to appear before the Committee on Commerce in 10 minutes, I do not know what we may be in favor of, but I do not think we ought to act precipitately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington object to the introduction of the resolution? That is the first question.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I object to the introduction of the resolution now.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JONES of Washington. In just a moment. After we hear Judge Payne, then I shall not object to the introduction of the resolution and possibly its consideration.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Then will the Senator allow me to introduce the resolution?

Mr. JONES of Washington. So that it may lie over?

Mr. MCKELLAR. So that it may lie over until after the committee hear Judge Payne this afternoon?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that is all right.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The reason I offer the resolution is that within 10 minutes I went to the telephone and called up Judge Payne, and he told me that the sale would be consummated on Monday. I asked him if he would not defer it, and he then said that he expected to be before the committee, and hoped that I would come into the committee and hear what he might have to say, but my distinct understanding of my conversation with him was that the sale was going to be consummated on Monday. My resolution merely directs that the sale be not made until further action of Congress. I think there ought to be such an expression on our part, regardless of whether or not Judge Payne is willing to consummate the sale, for we ought to control that particular situation at this time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I shall not object to the introduction of the resolution and have it lie on the table, but the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] stated on the floor of the Senate a few moments ago that he also had talked with Judge Payne over the telephone, and that Judge Payne had told him that the sale would not be concluded on Monday, but that the Shipping Board was simply to receive bids.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I desire to ask if it may be assumed that the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee will make some report to the Senate this afternoon as to the result of the investigation before the committee?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will be very glad to do so, if the Senator would like to hear such a statement. Judge Payne requested the opportunity to come before the committee at 2.30 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. POMERENE. I shall be obliged to be on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, but it does seem to me that the situation is so acute that whatever information the Senator from Washington gathers this afternoon ought to be placed at the disposal of the Senate, so that we may take some action this afternoon, if it is deemed wise so to do.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I shall be very glad to present the information to the Senate after the hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to conduct business in an orderly manner. Is there objection to the introduction of the resolution by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is introduced. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the resolution may lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection. The request is not debatable; it may not be now discussed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has the floor.

Mr. LODGE. I rise to a point of order. Does not the objection to the resolution carry it over until to-morrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the rule, as the Chair understands.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I make the objection with the understanding on my part that the resolution may be called up by unanimous consent later on in the afternoon, if the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] should desire to do so,

Mr. LODGE. That is all right.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Then it is understood that the objection is for the moment, and that later on I may call up the resolution?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that the Senator may submit his request at any rate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has been recognized.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Oregon. Does he yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. STERLING. A moment ago I called for the regular order, which is the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is in the regular order, as the Chair understands. The Chair can not prevent Senators from talking.

Mr. STERLING. Very well; I can not take Senators from the floor, as I understand; but I should like to have the privilege of yielding to the Senator from Oregon, if the Senator is going to consume very much time.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thought I had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to say to the Senator from South Dakota that while we are under the regular order now, I shall be out of order in that I shall not discuss the subject that is immediately before the Senate.

Mr. STERLING. Very well.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, in December, 1915, and possibly earlier, I introduced Senate bill 1695, to provide for the military and naval training of the citizen forces of the United States. That bill was referred to the Military Affairs Committee, and on the 29th of December, 1915, shortly after its introduction, it was referred to the War Department for the suggestions and criticisms of the General Staff. The Military Affairs Committee of the Senate immediately entered upon a hearing and spent months in the consideration of the bill. On February 24, 1916, a report was prepared by the General Staff, which recommended the adoption of some of the provisions of the bill and proposed certain amendments to other provisions of it. So the subject of universal military training had a pretty extensive public hearing and was fairly discussed before the Military Affairs Committee months before the United States entered the war.

The Senate hearings provoked a general discussion of the subject by the press, the magazines, and individuals throughout the country, and the discussion finally crystallized American sentiment in favor of some sort of compulsory service that would make available the man power of the United States in any war that might thereafter threaten the United States. I think it safe to say that this bill and these discussions made possible the selective service act of May 17, 1917.

I am induced to speak briefly upon the subject now, Mr. President, because of the fact that an article appeared in the Washington Post of this morning written by one of its distinguished correspondents, which indicates that our Republican friends intend to take to the woods on universal military training as our Democratic friends in the other House did on the same subject at the very time when the President and the administration took a firm stand for some form of universal military training, and the President had appealed to the Democrats of the House not to make a party issue of the subject in the following forceful letter only a few days ago transmitted through Secretary Baker:

I am told that a caucus of the Democratic members of the House of Representatives has been called to consider pending military legislation, and the suggestion has been made that a resolution be adopted committing the Democratic membership of the House against the policy of general military training. In the present circumstances it would seem to me unfortunate to make a party issue upon this subject, particularly since within a few months the party will assemble in convention and declare the principles upon which it deems it wise to commit itself in a national election. The present disturbed state of the world does not permit such sureness with regard to America's obligations as to allow us lightly to decide upon this great question upon purely military grounds while the demonstrated advantages to the use of the country which came from military service in the war plainly suggest that in the national interest quite apart from military considerations the moderate and carefully conducted course of military training may have the highest possible advantage.

APPROVES GENERAL STAFF PLAN.

In our discussion of the subject, you will recall I gave my approval in principle to the various very moderate training projects suggested by the General Staff, and I would be very glad to have you convey to ap-

propriate Members of the House who will attend the caucus my strong feeling against action by the caucus which will tend to interpose an arbitrary party determination to the consideration which this subject should receive from the best thought of the Members of the House, considering alike the national emergencies which may confront us and the great disciplinary and other advantages which such a system plainly promises for the young men of the country.

I can not believe that our Republican friends, most of whom have stood so long for universal military training, intend to desert the proposition at a time when there seems to be a reasonable chance for the enactment of legislation that will provide for the training of the young men of the country. The article to which I refer indicates that universal training will not be considered at this session of Congress. It indicates that leaders of the party in power have practically agreed upon a commission to examine into and report upon the feasibility and advisability of having the United States adopt a system for the universal military training of its youth. I say, Mr. President, I can not believe that that comes with any authority from our friends on the other side, who—not all, but as a rule—have from the very first, and long before America entered the war and after it entered the war, stood for some system of the training of the young men of the country which would make them realize and would make the country realize that every man owed some service to his country in return for the protection which he received from the Government whenever an emergency demanded his service.

If universal training of the young men of America between the ages of 18 or 21, or fixing the age limits as they were later fixed by the selective service law between the ages of 21 and 30, had been adopted as a policy when the bill for that purpose was first proposed in 1915, our country in all probability would not have been involved in the World War. This statement of my belief is based upon the impressions which Germany must have received from the ultra pacifists in the United States, and she thought, no doubt, (1) that our people, though unprepared for war, would not prepare for war; (2) that the United States would not in any event declare war, no matter how criminal the acts of Germany might be; (3) that if war was declared and an Army raised it could not be transported to the field of operations in time to render efficient aid to the Allies; and (4) if all of these things were accomplished the American soldier would not fight. Who is there that does not know that if 2,000,000 young men had been trained prior to April 6, 1917, when America entered the war, Germany would not have pursued the ruthless submarine warfare which eventually led us into war? Germany would not have dared pursue a policy which she must have known would inevitably drive the United States to war and to an alliance with the Entente powers. If such a policy had been in vogue when war came we could, within 24 hours, have put a trained body of men in the field and the only question in that event to be solved would have been to get them to the field of action. Germany was right when she said America was unprepared, but in each of the other three propositions mentioned she later ascertained to her sorrow that she was wrong.

America was willing to prepare; America could and did get her troops to Europe; and American troops when once arrived in Europe were not afraid to and did fight. As a matter of fact, they were decisive of the great World War.

It took us from the declaration of war until September, 1917, to raise an Army under the selective-service law sufficiently large when trained to make victory on the part of the Allies a possibility and to lay the foundation for the Army to make victory an accomplished fact. Why now abandon the policy which the selective-service law recognizes and has proven to be a practical military policy, modified, of course, to the extent of compelling the youth of our country to train for a few months in one year rather than calling them to the colors for military service for a fixed time or for a time of emergency? Are we to abandon it because there is no war or prospect of war? War is waging in Europe at the present moment and threatened in other parts of the world. It is threatening on this very continent and it is impossible to tell how soon we may be driven to war with one of our neighbors, against whose lawless methods within our borders we are now compelled to maintain an armed force. There is no way of estimating how many lives might have been saved, even if war had been a possibility, if on the 6th day of April, 1917, a million of our young men had been properly trained for military service. There is no way of estimating what a great saving there might have been in money, extravagantly spent in an emergency, and property destroyed as the result of unpreparedness. The best possible way to keep out of war is to let the world know that our civilian population is prepared to defend itself whenever necessary.

The opponents of universal military training are resting their opposition on two main arguments; one, that such training will involve excessive cost, and the other that the adoption of universal military training will commit us to a policy of militarism. It is quite possible to make a system of military training both expensive and militaristic, but, as the particular system of training proposed in the bill now on the Senate calendar is neither the one nor the other, perhaps it would be just as well to consider the main features of the military system proposed therein before condemning it on either count.

The bill proposes that the young men of the country should receive the minimum amount of training required to fit them for service in a citizen army if a great war should occur during the years of their young manhood. For each young man it proposes four months' training at a training camp and thereafter membership for five years in a local unit of the citizen army formed near his home and officered by citizen officers. During this period he will be expected to attend two additional camps with his local unit. This does not involve compulsory military service, for under the terms of the bill the organized citizen army can not be called for military service except in the event of great national emergency expressly declared by Congress. Military service in time of peace and in minor emergencies will be performed by the Regular Army and the National Guard, both of which will be composed solely of volunteers.

The total attendance required of each young man during his period of membership in the citizen army will be about 150 days, or an average of 30 days in each year. Now, as a regular soldier is supported at the expense of the Government for 12 months of the year, and as a citizen soldier, under the terms of this bill, would be at the expense of the Government only one month each year, it will follow that 12 citizen trained soldiers can be maintained for the cost of one regular soldier. This is bound to form the cheapest effective military establishment that can be devised. Under this plan we can have 1,000,000 trained young men living at their homes but prepared for war and organized under trained leaders for the cost of maintaining 80,000 regular soldiers. In other words, as the Senate bill proposes the minimum number of high-priced soldiers and the maximum number of low-priced soldiers, it necessarily involves the cheapest plan of preparedness that can be devised.

In the organization of this citizen army, the veterans of the war in each locality will be invited to enter the force voluntarily for the purpose of forming its first corps of officers and noncommissioned officers. Thereafter, as the young men of the country are trained and join the citizen army, they will receive from their older brothers the benefit of their war experience, and we will thus perpetuate as a permanent institution of national defense the great citizen army which this war created at such enormous cost. This is a proper and patriotic use of those war veterans who are willing to serve for a time in this capacity, and the citizen army plan has therefore received the indorsement of the American Legion. Opponents of universal training are opposing this plan on the ground that we can evade the whole question of preparedness by simply proposing to draft the veterans of the war in any new emergency that may arise. These brave men have done their bit and now desire to help prepare their younger brothers to meet their share of the burden of the future. They can not be expected to look with favor on a proposition that would place the whole burden of potential military service upon them for the next 10 years.

In considering the economic aspect of the problem of preparedness it should be understood that universal training for a citizen army not only proposes the cheapest effective system of national defense but that under such a system of training there will be a positive increase of public wealth—much more than sufficient to offset the entire cost of the military establishment. Under the plan proposed, illiteracy will be corrected and foreign-born young men will be given an opportunity not only to learn English but to enter into a direct association with their native-born fellow citizens. At the beginning of each man's training, pathological tendencies will be discovered and opportunities given for remedial action. With wholesome physical training and hygienic instruction, each young man will take up his life work with improved health and with a resultant expectancy of a longer useful life. He will learn how essential discipline is to all organized effort. Under the system of training, natural leaders will be discovered and their capacity for leadership will be developed as an essential characteristic of the citizen army. The system of training in this way will benefit the entire manhood of the Nation, and the effect of such improvement will be reflected in better morals, better social organization, and increased public wealth.

It has also been argued that the adoption of universal military training will involve the establishment of a militaristic system like that of Germany. Those who present this argument entirely overlook the fact that universal military training is also a characteristic of the democratic defense systems of Switzerland and Australia. If we apply universal military training to a great standing army, officered by an exclusive professional military caste, and controlled by an autocratic government, we do have a militaristic system, but if we apply it to a citizen army officered by citizen soldiers and controlled like other democratic institutions, by the people themselves, we have a democratic and not a militaristic military system. The Senate bill proposes training for just that kind of a citizen army, and as all of our great wars have been fought with an army of that kind, the bill proposes merely to adapt a traditional national institution to meet the requirements of modern war.

Those who reject universal military training on the ground of expense are rejecting the cheapest possible form of preparedness. Those who reject it on the ground of militarism are rejecting the most democratic and the least militaristic system of national preparedness that has ever been devised. Those who reject the patriotic proposal of the veterans of the war that they be allowed to give their younger brothers better preparation for future emergency are really proposing an injustice to men who have already served and done their bit. If the opponents of this bill will consider what it really proposes, if they will listen to the demands of intelligent public sentiment, they will discover that their position rests on bad military policy, bad economics, and worse politics.

The proper training of the young men of the country at some period during the ages prescribed by the bill will bring to them the following benefits:

- (1) Physical and, consequently, mental development, because there can be no strong mind in a physically defective body.
- (2) Discipline, very much needed in this day and generation.
- (3) The inculcation of patriotism and the love of the flag.
- (4) The Americanization of the different elements which compose American life.
- (5) Democratization of our youth, making the rich and poor learn shoulder to shoulder to perform our country's service when needed.
- (6) Vocational training, fitting the man to do the thing for which he finds himself best fitted to do.

And last, but not least, teaching the laws of hygiene and sanitation, so that the young man when he is called into service, or when engaged in peaceful pursuits, knows how to protect himself against the ravages of disease.

I had the pleasure of visiting a few days ago Camp Holabird, in Maryland, where there were from 800 to 1,000 young men, some of whom had enlisted for one year and some for longer periods of time, who are learning the mechanism and building of automobiles. They start in at the very foundation; and, when they get through with their period of enlistment, they are graduated into positions at from \$40 to \$60 a week, as I was assured by the officers in charge. The young men hardly get out of the Army where this training was being given under competent instructors until their services were in demand by the great automobile factories of the country. I wish Senators who oppose universal military training—and that includes vocational and industrial training and fitting young men for the duties of life—would visit that camp and see what can be accomplished by the American youth under competent instruction, while wearing the uniform of their country.

The reports from the office of the Provost Marshal General and the Surgeon General of the Army concerning the physical condition of the young men called under the selective service law disclose the fact that 21 per cent of the population subject to the provisions of the law were unfit for military service. These were unfit for any kind of military service. Think of that, Mr. President! Twenty-one per cent out of the whole of the Army called under the selective service law.

Among the 79 per cent who were found fit for Army life the majority were accepted for "general military service"—that is, for any form of military activity. Another part of the 79 per cent had defects disqualifying them for general military service at the time of their entry, but the defects were remediable and these young men were placed in a remediable group in the hope that their defects might be cured. The remainder of the 79 per cent consisted of men who had defects disqualifying them for general military service, these men being only fit for noncombatant service. To provide for these men the development battalion was organized—

(a) To relieve divisions, replacement organizations, and so forth, of all unfit men.

(b) To conduct intensive training with a view to developing unfit men for duty with combatant or noncombatant forces either within the United States or for service abroad.

(c) To promptly rid the service of all men who, after trial and examination, are found physically, mentally, or morally incapable of performing the duties of a soldier.

The underlying principle of the development battalion was to restore the physically disqualified men so they would be fit for general military service. From reports which are approximately correct the results obtained by the development battalions were as follows:

Total number of men trained in or transferred to or discharged from development battalions was approximately 224,717—just think of it, Mr. President—classified as follows:

- (a) Venereals, 77,456 (34.4 per cent of total).
- (b) Orthopedic cases, 28,823 (12.7 per cent of total).
- (c) Mental conditions, 4,798 (2.1 per cent of total).
- (d) Functional heart conditions, 10,917 (4.8 per cent of total).
- (e) Miscellaneous physical conditions, 53,540 (23.7 per cent of total).

(f) Non-English speaking, illiterate, morally unfit, conscientious objectors, draft evaders, enemy aliens, and so forth, 33,821 (23.3 per cent of total).

Now, note this:

Of this number of men, approximately 168,583 at the time the armistice was signed had been reclaimed and assigned to some duty in the Army. In other words, these defectives, some of them with communicable diseases, were reclaimed and restored to useful life and sent back to their homes to perform the functions of normal civil life.

What an immense service to the man power of the Nation and to the physically defective who might have become derelicts but for the discipline of the Army and the efforts of the Medical Corps! No one can read the reports of the Provost Marshal General and the Surgeon General without coming to the conclusion that no one agency has done as much for the whole people of the United States as the military service and the experience of 5,000,000 young men in the cantonments, camps, and in every branch of the military service.

In order that those who may be interested in the subject may know where to find this material—and there are thousands of people who do not have access to it—I am just going to call attention to some of the official publications where the information can be obtained. The subject of universal training of our youth may be temporarily sidetracked; but when the young men of the American Legion who are in favor of this system get about among the people of this country and tell them and show to them by ocular demonstration the benefits which were received by them from a brief Army service, this country is going to take up the subject with a renewed and vital interest that will compel our friends to consider this as a part of the educational system of the United States.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, would it interrupt the line of the Senator's argument if I should ask him some questions for information?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No, indeed.

Mr. KING. A day or two ago I received a letter from a very intelligent man who is deeply interested in this question. He seemed to be very much disturbed by the constant averment that the cost of universal military training would be prohibitive, particularly at the present time; and he made the inquiry as to whether there could not be some coordination between the States and the Federal Government, through the National Guard or through the organizations provided by the States, under which this military training could be obtained at less expense than had been suggested by the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. As I said in the opening, I intend to discuss this subject in detail from the standpoint of expense a little later on. I am not prepared to do it at this moment; but I will say to my friend, the Senator from Utah, that while the expense might be quite large in the inception of the organization of such a scheme, yet by a gradual process it will reduce the expense to the Government of the United States, because practically there will be no use of maintaining a large standing army in time of peace. Why maintain a standing army when upon a moment's call the citizenship of the country can be rallied around the colors, so that you will eventually eliminate entirely the expense of a regular army?

The figures upon that subject I am not quite prepared to give, but I promise the Senator that I am going to discuss it from that viewpoint, not with the hope of convincing this Congress that it should pass on any legislation dealing with the matter, but

in order that the subject may not "die a-borning," as it seems to be the determined purpose of some people shall be the case.

In order that those interested in the subject may know where to find information in regard to it, I call attention to the report of the Surgeon General of the United States Army to the Secretary of War, 1919, vols. 1 and 2. They go into this whole subject. I also call attention to a bulletin printed for the use of the Senate committee on Military Affairs, entitled "Defects Found in Drafted Men. Statistical Information Compiled from the Draft Records, Showing the Physical Condition of the Men Registered and Examined in Pursuance of the Requirements of the Selective Service Act." This latter was prepared under the direction of Surg. Gen. M. W. Ireland by Dr. Albert G. Love, lieutenant colonel of the Marine Corps, and by Maj. Charles B. Davenport of the Regular Army. I challenge anybody to read this report and come to any other conclusion than that the American youth have been wholesomely improved by their service in the Army of the United States. It has called the attention of the American people to the fact that nearly one-quarter of the male population of the United States was physically defective because of some remediable disease, and nothing officially is being done to undertake to improve the physical health of the young men.

Why, Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Utah that out in the western country, when the sheep were afflicted with scabies, and because thereof confined to the territorial limits of the State, and we could not ship them across the line, the States and the Government got busy, and were willing to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to remove this plague in order to place our sheep in such condition that they could be taken to the market; and yet the young men of the State of my friend the Senator from Utah and from my State, afflicted with diseases that affect the whole of our national life, are permitted to travel over this country bearing the germs of disease which are imbedded in every child that is born to such men, and when we talk about undertaking to do something to reclaim and to purify the blood of the American youth we are met with the statement that it is too expensive!

Ah, Mr. President, it seems to me that when we are willing to appropriate money to eradicate the tick from the cattle in the South, scabies from the sheep in the West, and immense sums of money to cure hog cholera and other animal diseases we ought to be willing to expend some money and to enact some legislation to purify the blood of the American youth, and make them fit to live and procreate their species. It is not a very pleasant subject to dwell upon, but you know and I know that parents do not discuss these delicate questions with their children. The family physician does not discuss them with the families under his charge. We allow them to grow up in ignorance, and many of these young men who have gone into the Army learned for the first time in camp life, from the surgeon in charge and from moving pictures and other instrumentalities, the dangers which are incident to these and other diseases, which universal training and a proper education will practically eradicate from the American youth.

Another book to which I call attention is Bulletin No. 11, which is issued from the office of the Surgeon General, entitled "Physical Examination of the First Million Draft Recruits; Methods and Results," compiled under direction of the Surgeon General and dated 1919. That shows the result of the physical examination of young men from every State in the Union, and I will say to the Senate that the results of these physical examinations are simply astounding, if one will only take the trouble to read them. The great wonder to me is that with the youth of this country—young men and young women, too, if you please—growing up in ignorance of the physical structure of the human body, entirely ignorant of the social relations and obligations, and entirely ignorant of the laws of hygiene and sanitation, that they are not worse afflicted than they are now, without any instruction or regulation at home or through the family physician or anyone else. But when these young men get in the Army, the instruction and regulation are compulsory.

There is a general impression that when these young men go into the Army they learn the things that bring to them these diseases. On the contrary, they were worse when they came from civil life than they were in the Army. They were improved by their life in the Army. A major general who commanded a division at Coblenz told me that when his division went to Brest for the purpose of embarkation for home, there were only 12 men in 28,000 that were afflicted with any social disease. What better showing could there be than that? They are instructed for the first time in Army life as to the dangers incident to the diseases which they contracted before going into the Army and while they were in civil life and which are cured when they get into Army life.

Mr. President, that is all that I care to say at this time, except that I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks an article written by Col. Weston P. Chamberlain, of the Medical Corps of the Army, on the subject of "Development battalions." This article shows what the development battalions were for, the class of men who went in, the number who went in and those who went out, practically fitted for military service to their country. I also ask to have printed another article written by the same distinguished medical authority, an officer in the United States Army, on "What the World War and military training have done for the health of American men." There the whole subject is discussed at length, and I venture to say that if people will read these reports they will look at this subject from a new angle.

I ask that they be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPENDIX.

DEVELOPMENT BATTALIONS.

SUBSTANDARD MEN.

The physical examinations of drafted men disclosed the fact that 21 per cent of the population subject to the provisions of the draft were physically unfit for military service. This means not merely for combatant service, but for any kind of military service. Among the 79 per cent who were found fit for Army life, the majority were accepted for "general military service"—that is, for any form of military activity. Another part of the 79 per cent had defects disqualifying them for general service at the time, but these defects were remediable and such men were placed in a class called the "deferred remediable group," consisting of men who would be suitable for any service after their specific defects had been remedied. The remainder of the 79 per cent consisted of men who had defects disqualifying them for general service, but not sufficient in kind or degree to prevent them from serving their country in the noncombatant and less strenuous branches of the military establishment. These men were accepted for "special and limited service." In the spring of 1918 large numbers of special and limited service men, together with a considerable group of those with remediable defects, were brought into camp. The Medical Department of the Army was faced with the problem of putting these men into the best possible physical condition as promptly as possible. Great numbers were operated upon. At one time there were about 10,000 cases of hernia awaiting surgical operations. Treatment for diseased tonsils, abnormal nasal passages, pathological conditions of the teeth, and defective feet were carried out in enormous numbers of cases. Other classes of men required prolonged courses of physical training to make them fit. Patients who had been ill for a considerable period needed a "hardening" course before they were able to resume their duties. Vast numbers of men with venereal disease, contracted prior to induction, had to be placed under treatment and restricted to camp, yet were not sick enough to necessitate care in a hospital. To provide for all of the above classes of cases the "development battalion" was originated, and the supervision of the medical and surgical features of these battalions was one of the functions of the Miscellaneous Section of the Division of Sanitation.

On May 9, 1918, the War Department issued General Order No. 45, providing for the formation of one or more development battalions for the period of the existing emergency in each of the divisional camps of the National Army, the National Guard, and the Regular Army, and in other camps when directed by the Secretary of War. The function of the development battalions was laid down in G. O. 45 as follows:

"a. To relieve divisions, replacement organizations, etc., of all unfit men.

"b. To conduct intensive training with a view to developing unfit men for duty with combatant or noncombatant forces either within the United States or for service abroad.

"c. To promptly rid the service of all men who, after thorough trial and examination, are found physically, mentally, or morally incapable of performing the duties of a soldier."

On June 5, 1918, The Adjutant General issued an order forming the committee on development battalions, which was to meet with the General Staff. This committee consisted of a medical officer, a line officer, and a civilian representative. During the first two months after this committee was formed an officer of the Medical Corps of the Army represented the Surgeon General's office on this committee for purposes of liaison. On September 9, 1918, Office Order No. 84, S. G. O., transferred the medical officer on the committee from the Division of Physical Reconstruction to the Division of Sanitation, "for the purpose of assuming the duties in connection with the activities of the development battalions, the work of which is placed under the direction of the officer in charge of the Division of Sanitation."

Development battalions, up to this date, had not functioned as intended. Within a short period over a hundred thousand physically handicapped individuals had been thrown into the battalions in the various camps without adequate provisions being made, on the part of either the line or the medical officers, to handle such numbers. Development battalions became great dumping grounds where slightly sick and physically handicapped individuals were collected, together with the venereals, the morally unfit, the illiterates, the non-English speaking, the alien enemies, the draft evaders, and the conscientious objectors. Men were transferred to the development battalions more rapidly than they could be classified and discharged, so that no time was given for the inadequate personnel to carry on the real development work.

In order to correct these conditions, the Chief of the Division of Sanitation established a group of "inspector-instructors" for the purpose of improving the medical work of development battalions. These officers were to travel from camp to camp in order to straighten out the many difficulties. Camp Meade, Maryland, had organized a very efficient system in its development battalions and these inspector-instructors were given a short course of intensive training at this camp. On account of various difficulties, only three inspector-instructors were sent into the field. They visited in all twenty-seven camps.

Through the aid of the inspector-instructors, and as a result of circulars of instructions which were issued by the Committee on Development

Battalions of the General Staff, about 15 camps developed very efficient systems in their development battalions before the signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918. The men were rapidly classified and transferred, or discharged, from the battalions by securing cooperation between line officers and medical officers. Physical development work was established, and was at all times supervised by the medical officers. Segregation of the venereals from the remainder of the men in the battalions was accomplished. In a number of camps there were established schools for instruction in English for the illiterates and non-English speaking, and for special training in occupations useful for the Army. Recreation, games, and other things tending to improve the morale of the men were promoted, and proved of great value.

Unfortunately, immediately after the signing of the armistice, as a result of the misinterpretation placed upon certain War Department circulars, the impression went broadcast into the camps that all men in development battalions were to be demobilized at once regardless of their physical condition. The morale went down to a very low ebb, and in most places it was impossible to continue any of the real functions prescribed for these battalions in a satisfactory manner.

While the life of the development battalions was short, these having practically ceased to exist two months after the signing of the armistice, yet the principles established by this experiment have been well worth while and will, no doubt, play an important part in the Army of the future. The underlying principle is that men who are, or who become, unfit for full military duty should be reclaimed and assigned to limited service—providing the disability is not of such a nature as to totally unfit them. This is a saving of man power which may be very essential in time of war. This practice may not be necessary in time of peace, but even then it has a humane side which should appeal to all, since, if not needed for military service, the disabled soldier may be put in condition to be of maximum benefit to himself and the community, in civil life.

The following figures, which were obtained from the consolidated reports submitted by the several camps and which cover operations from the organization of the development battalions to November 13, 1918, indicate approximately the results attained by the development battalions. Some of the camps failed to submit their final report, and in a few places development battalions were not yet organized, according to War Department orders; consequently these figures are to a certain extent incomplete. It is believed, however, that they are a close approximation and that the percentages given are usable factors; if any error exists it is that these percentages are too low.

Total number of men trained in, or transferred to, or discharged from development battalions was approximately 224,717, classified as follows:

(a) Venereals.....	77,456 (34.4 per cent of total).
(b) Orthopedic cases.....	28,823 (12.7 per cent of total).
(c) Mental conditions.....	4,798 (2.1 per cent of total).
(d) Functional heart conditions.....	10,917 (4.8 per cent of total).
(e) Miscellaneous physical conditions.....	53,540 (23.7 per cent of total).
(f) Non-English speaking, illiterates, morally unfit, conscientious objectors, draft evaders, enemy aliens, etc.....	33,621 (22.3 per cent of total).

From the above total the following number were classified and transferred to service or were discharged or otherwise disposed of:

To Class A (general military service).....	41,450 (16 per cent of total 224,717)
To Class C-1 (limited overseas duty).....	46,054 (20 per cent of total 224,717)
To Class C-2 (limited domestic duty only).....	42,530 (19 per cent of total 224,717)
Total number discharged.....	36,274
Total deserted.....	919
Total deaths.....	1,356

168,583

These figures indicate that of the 168,583 men who had been transferred to development battalions and finally disposed of at the time of the armistice, about 75 per cent were reclaimed and assigned to some duty in the Army. Of course, a large portion of these were the curable venereal cases. Without development battalions the majority of the above-indicated men, except the venereals, would have been discharged for disability and lost to the military service. Had the war continued for several years the saving of man power by these organizations would have been considerable. At the date of the armistice these battalions, which were a new experiment, had just reached the point where they could function efficiently. In France the development battalion served an even more useful purpose than in this country and resulted in the salvage of many men who had broken down under the strain of military service. This was particularly the case in orthopedic conditions.

On the whole, it may be said that the induction of special and limited service men, and more particularly of the remediable defective group, in 1918 was not very satisfactory. The calling to the colors of the remediable group was soon stopped on recommendation of the Surgeon General. Had the war continued to the point where a severe strain was placed upon our man power, the use of these partially defective men would have been of the greatest value. In 1918, however, our man power was not falling, and the vital need was for speed and the promptest possible mobilization of able-bodied men. The limited-service and defective men took up space in camp that might have been filled with perfect men, and required the services of officers who could have been used elsewhere. They occupied beds in the hospitals which were needed for the vast number of acutely sick and used up the time of surgeons who could have been otherwise employed to better advantage. They proved of doubtful usefulness. Many never performed any service after months of support by the Government, and many others performed service in a more or less unsatisfactory manner. Finally, many of those who were inducted in the above groups will probably ultimately receive compensation from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance for defects aggravated by military conditions which would not have adversely affected a physically perfect man.

In any scheme of general military service the physical training and development of substandard men would be of great ultimate benefit to the Nation. Likewise the correction of physical defects and the treatment of existing diseases.

WHAT THE WORLD WAR AND MILITARY TRAINING HAVE DONE FOR THE HEALTH OF AMERICAN MEN.

[By Col. Weston P. Chamberlain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army.]

After the rapid mobilization of nearly 5,000,000 men for the military forces of the United States (Army, Navy, and Marines), the cessation of hostilities at a period in the war when the American battle

casualties had been insignificant, as compared with the losses of the other belligerent countries, offers a favorable opportunity to consider the brighter side of war and to estimate what benefits have accrued to the Nation as a whole, and to the individual soldier in particular, as a result of calling to the colors approximately one-twentieth of the entire population of the United States. These benefits are manifold, and may be partially and roughly classified as follows:

First. Improvement in physical development as a result of outdoor life, good food, regular hours, and strenuous physical training.

Second. Detection and cure of many obscure and latent pathological conditions, particularly hookworm, malaria, venereal disease, tuberculosis, bad teeth, etc.

Third. A determination, through the draft examination, of the actual physical condition of the adult male population of military age, and a consequent awakening of the Nation to the necessity for efforts directed toward limiting the possibilities for the continued evolution of physically defective citizens.

Fourth. Instruction in sanitation and personal hygiene gained through both precept and practice in camp. Some of this acquired knowledge the discharged soldier will take back to his home and transmit to his family and fellow citizens.

Fifth. Education in sex relations and in the matter of protection from the dangers attending illicit sexual indulgence. This whole subject really belongs under the preceding subhead, but is such a large and important factor that it has been given a separate heading.

Sixth. Prevention of alcoholic excess by precept and local restriction in sale. This also might be included under the fourth subhead; but it is of sufficient importance to form a chapter in itself.

Seventh. Training in discipline and the development in the soldier of a respect for authority, sadly lacking in the prewar American youth. Among those promoted to commissioned or noncommissioned grade there has been developed also the power to command and to exact obedience.

Eighth. The protection by antityphoid vaccination of 5,000,000 men against the danger of contracting typhoid fever for at least several years to come.

I will now discuss more fully some of the matters referred to in the above subheads:

First. Alertness, activity, strength, endurance, and discipline, combined with a body free from disease, are the first requisites of a soldier. These qualities are obtained largely by a scientific system of gradual and progressive physical training which is regulated to the condition of those who are to undergo it. As applied to the recruit, this physical training has a special technical value in that it does much to perfect him in the military endurance and the coordinated effort by which the soldier is enabled to bear the hardships and overcome the difficulties of warfare. The beneficial results of physical exercise during the training period are supplemented by the outdoor life, the regular hours required, the plain but simple food, the good sanitary surroundings, and the many other features which promote the development of a high type of physical manhood.

Improvement in the physical development of the young man entering the Army has been most striking. Increase in girth and chest expansion is particularly noticeable. As a sanitary inspector I have visited dozens of camps and one of my duties has been to investigate the thoroughness of the physical examination made on arrival of the men at the camp and repeated before the soldier is demobilized. At the first of these examinations the streams of naked men passing me consisted for the most part of individuals who were awkward, narrow chested, flabbily muscled, often with a stoop. Divisions which were being examined prior to discharge from the service presented, almost exclusively, bronzed, erect, broad-chested soldiers, with fine muscular development and a characteristically alert and self-confident air.

Exact statistics on this matter will some day be available, the records of the examinations at time of entrance into the service and at time of demobilization being filed together in the office of the adjutant general, where they are available for study. At present we can only give general impressions and partial estimates as to the degree of physical improvement. Col. D. C. Howard, Medical Corps, in charge of the Division of Sanitation in the office of the Surgeon General of the Army, estimates that the average gain in weight in the first year of military service is from fifteen to twenty pounds. The records of one company of National Guard troops under the semitropical conditions existing on the Mexican border in 1916 showed an average gain of 12½ pounds in nine months. Studies on this subject made by the Division of Food and Nutrition in the office of the Surgeon General, showed in one infantry company an average gain of 30 pounds per man after four months of service, and in three artillery batteries an average gain of 6.4 pounds in six months. Another study showed 2.6 pounds gain in five weeks. There is no doubt that the increase in weight in the soldier is almost entirely in muscular tissue.

On return to civil pursuits the added physical vigor of the one-time soldier should stimulate a desire for more active out-door exercise and should make for better health and a consequent higher type of citizenship.

Second. The physical examination carried out by physicians of local boards disclosed many diseased conditions, some remediable and others not. Similar results attended the examination of candidates for voluntary enlistment in the Army, Navy and Marine Corps. The examination made by the medical officers of the Army as soon as drafted men arrived at camp detected some other men with disabilities which had escaped the scrutiny of local board examiners. Such of these individuals as had physical defects or diseases, which were not disqualifying for military service, received, after entering the service, the most up-to-date treatment to cure or alleviate their defects. Among the most notable examples of this are the conditions due to hookworm infestation, malarial infection, venereal diseases, and deficient and diseased teeth.

In the first million men examined at camp, 2.8 per cent had venereal disease. In the second million 5.4 per cent were so infected, and this figure, for reasons not necessary to enter upon, probably represents approximately the percentage one may expect to meet with in civil life among men of the age period concerned (21 to 30 years). These figures include only obvious cases of syphilis, gonorrhoea, and chancroid which were manifest at the moment of examination. Wasserman examinations were not made, nor microscopic examinations of smears except in special instances. Persons who had been previously infected and cured are not included in these statistics. Venereal disease, except in rare instances, was not cause for rejection. All these infected men were treated, and, where possible, cured, during their military service. Many of them, had they remained in civil life, would never have been adequately treated and cured.

An extensive survey was made to determine the presence of intestinal parasites in the Army. Over half a million soldiers received careful parasitological examinations. Among these men, mostly Southerners, 69,508 showed the presence of one or more intestinal parasites, and 56,740 of this number were infested with hookworms. The incident of hookworm infestations among men from the Southern States was 18 per cent. These men were treated during their military service and ultimately returned to their communities freed from the menace of this disabling parasite.

After entry into the service the frequent physical examinations, and the presence of medical officers who were always readily available for consultation, led to the early detection of new or latent diseases, which were at once made the subject of intensive and scientific treatment until the soldier was cured or found to be definitely unfitted for the service. The early detection and treatment of disease undoubtedly saved many men who, in civil life, would have allowed their diseases to go on untreated until it was past cure. One of the most notable examples of this point is tuberculosis of the lungs. Early diagnosis has been the rule and all soldiers with the disease have been sent to up-to-date military sanatoria, where they are treated at Government expense until they are cured or have attained the maximum improvement to be expected. At one time there were 6,300 soldiers under treatment in these sanatoria and for a long time the number averaged 5,000.

The drafted men as well as the candidates for voluntary enlistment, who were rejected for military service, had brought to their attention the fact that they were physically defective. In many instances this fact had never before been known to the individual concerned. When the disability was due to disease the thoughtful individual would naturally place himself under the care of a physician. Undoubtedly many have done this with resulting benefit to the national health.

Third. The initial selective draft of 1917 gave the first opportunity for half a century to make a physical census in this country of the male population of military age. Only a portion of the figures have thus far been analyzed, and any extensive discussion of the subject in this paper would be out of place. A partial analysis shows that out of about 2,510,000 men between 21 and 30 years of age examined by local boards, 730,000, or 29.1 per cent, were rejected on physical grounds. Many of these rejections were naturally due to diseased conditions, often previously unknown to the individual. It is sufficient to say that the completed analysis of the figures will furnish a vast store of information regarding the physical condition of our population, and will point out many lines along which sanitary effort should be directed for the betterment of our national health. The geographical distribution of these problems is clearly indicated. Among the notable differences in geographical distribution of disease may be mentioned the great prevalence of goiter in the Pacific Northwest and the enormous preponderance of venereal disease in the Southern States.

Fourth. At great effort and expense our concentration camps in this country were provided with every requisite for a high grade of sanitation. The medical officers in charge were particularly selected for their experience as sanitarians, and they were assisted by selected sanitary engineers commissioned from civil life in the Sanitary Corps. The camps were models of cleanliness. Crowding of barracks and tents was limited as much as military conditions would permit and ventilation was carefully enforced. Ample water supplies were provided, and the water was filtered or chlorinated (or both) unless its purity was above suspicion. Shower baths were ample and the supply of warm water unlimited. Excellent sewer systems were installed at once in all cantonments, and ultimately in the tent camps also. All food was inspected before purchase and subsequently when put into use. Messes were under constant supervision of medical officers. Garbage was promptly removed and garbage cans carefully cleansed. Buildings were screened to protect against mosquitoes and flies, and the latter were also combated by extensive use of traps, fly paper, swatters and by removal of material in which they could breed. Extensive drainage and oiling projects were carried out in all southern camps, with the result that areas formerly malarious ceased to be so and mosquitoes became rare. Food handlers were examined to detect possible carriers of typhoid, paratyphoid, and dysentery, as well as to eliminate any with venereal disease. Camp laundries were established to launder the soldiers' clothing, and cleanliness of the clothing was enforced by frequent inspections. Under the direction of the United States Public Health Service and the military authorities the sanitary condition of towns and areas adjacent to camps was greatly improved. Vice and liquor selling were abolished or markedly limited. When the soldier left the cantonment and went into the field, in this country or in France, he was surrounded by every device for field sanitation which was known to be of military value.

In addition to the information which he gradually absorbed as a result of daily observation of the operation of sanitary methods, the soldier was also given didactic instruction in sanitation and personal hygiene by means of lectures, pamphlets, posters, and frequent individual advice and admonition. He was provided with a suitable shoe and gained some insight into the advantages of large and properly shaped footwear. His teeth were put in good condition. He was vaccinated against typhoid, paratyphoid, and smallpox. He was frequently inspected to detect incipient or existing disease. He was counseled to consult a medical officer as soon as he felt sick, instead of keeping about as long as he could, and he was impressed with the duty he owed to his comrades if he had any reason to believe that he himself was coming down with an infectious disease.

All this knowledge the soldier will retain and take back with him into civil life. We may expect that he will to some extent continue to be guided by Army precept and practice, and that he will transmit a part of his knowledge of hygiene to family and neighbors. He should be more eager to help to maintain municipal sanitation and to support legislation for adequate and efficient health supervision of his community.

The following figures indicate the enormous reduction in deaths which has resulted from the sanitary measures enforced during the present war, as compared with the results attained by the practices in vogue during the Civil War, the Franco-Prussian War, the Spanish-American War, and the Boer War. The tabulation indicates the actual deaths which occurred during the period September 1, 1917, and May 2, 1919, in our forces, both in the United States and in France (having an average strength for the entire period of approximately 2,121,396), and the number of deaths which would have occurred in any army of the same size for the same period if the mean annual death rates for the Civil War and for the Spanish-American War, respectively, had prevailed during the present war. The figures for the present war are based upon current telegraphic reports which are

approximately accurate but may be subject to slight revision on completion of final complete statistics:

	Number of deaths that occurred in present war, Sept. 1, 1917–May 2, 1919. Average strength approximately 2,121,396.	Number of deaths that would have occurred if the Civil War death rate had prevailed.	Number of deaths that would have occurred if the Spanish-American War death rate had prevailed.
Typhoid fever.....	213	51,133	68,164
Malaria.....	13	113,951	11,317
Dysentery.....	42	263,698	26,382
Smallpox.....	5	9,536	37
Pneumonia.....	41,747	236,962	6,086
Scarlet fever.....	167	112	222
Diphtheria.....	100	1,188	149
Tuberculosis.....	1,220	9,574	631
Meningitis.....	2,137	3,859	4,061
Other diseases.....	3,768	34,681	15,587
Total for diseases.....	49,412	227,094	112,656

¹ Includes malaria and remittent and congestive fevers.

² Includes dysentery and diarrhea.

³ Includes deaths listed from measles, influenza, empyema, inflammation of the lungs and pleurisy, as well as pneumonia.

In the Franco-Prussian War the Germans lost 9,000 men from typhoid fever. With reference to typhoid in the Boer War, Col. F. F. Russell, quotes from Lelshman, "Antityphoid Vaccination," (Glasgow Med. Jour., 1912, LXXVII, 408) as follows:

"We know in general that there was 57,684 cases of typhoid and 8,022 deaths among 380,605 men."

The low death rate from tuberculosis in the Spanish War as contrasted with the present war, is due to three causes: First, that the Spanish War was of short duration; second, that the Spanish War period was in the summer; thirdly, and most important, that during the Spanish War all cases of tuberculosis were discharged from the service almost as soon as diagnosed, and so the deaths when they occurred were credited not to the Army but to the civilian community. In our present war nearly all tuberculous soldiers are held in the Army for indefinite sanitarium treatment, and of course a certain per cent will die in the service while the majority are being cured.

The number of deaths from pneumonia is slightly greater for the present war than for the Civil War comparison, and much greater than the Spanish War comparison. The Spanish War rates were low because the war period was entirely in warm weather when pneumonia is infrequent. The greatest cause of the high pneumonia rate for the present war was the pandemic of influenza, a factor which occurs only about once in 30 years. Had this epidemic not occurred the rate would have been much lower than for the Civil War and probably lower even than for the Spanish War. Taken all in all, however, it must be confessed that the secret of the control of respiratory diseases, particularly pneumonia, still remains undiscovered.

Fifth. A program prepared by the Medical Department for the limitation of venereal disease in our Army has been in force for many years. With the outbreak of the World War efforts along this line were redoubled and the scope of the campaign was broadened through the assistance of agencies outside of the Army.

The activities of this program for combating venereal diseases were divided into educational, law enforcement, and early treatment sections. By educational measures every individual was reached, either through lectures, appropriate literature, or moving pictures, or all these methods combined, while especially suited enlisted men were detailed for duty with organizations in order to keep in close personal touch with the soldier and to promote his moral welfare. The temptations to the soldier were further reduced by furnishing him with attractive opportunities for recreation. This work was carried on largely by the Commission on Training Company Activities and by affiliated organizations. Wholesome amusements inside the camp and in the adjacent communities most frequently visited by the soldier were provided to satisfy the longing for adventure and excitement which so often overcomes the discretion of the lonely and idle man in a strange locality.

The Surgeon General assigned especially qualified officers, mostly lawyers, to the law enforcement division of the commission, to see that the Federal and local laws against prostitution and liquor selling were thoroughly enforced. The results exceeded all expectations. In a year and a half about 130 red-light districts were closed at the instigation of these officers. It is estimated that not more than five openly recognized red-light districts remained in the whole United States. Street-walking and the connivance with prostitution of lodging house and hotel keepers, automobile drivers, and others has been consistently kept down. Trained female social-workers, experts in the building and management of reformatories and detention houses, and other civilian investigators participated in the work. Cooperation from the police and health officials and the legislative bodies of the States and cities, as a whole, has been excellent. As a result of these various activities the incidence of venereal disease has been diminished, the entire problem of combating this plague has been brought out into the open, and the necessity for a future campaign to lessen the occurrence of the social evil has been placed squarely before the public.

From incomplete statistics of the war it is shown that of 225,000 cases of venereal disease 200,000 were contracted before enlistment, that is, before the men joined the Army. The record of the Army for cases contracted after enlistment has been good, showing the effect of the combination of the several measures included in the Surgeon General's program.

In addition to these preventive measures adequate treatment has been provided for every soldier infected with this class of diseases, and not only that, but under present regulations men so infected, whether they brought the disease into the Army with them or acquired it after entrance, are being retained in the service until they are no longer infectious to others nor a danger to the community to which they go.

Sixth. The need for protecting the soldier in camp from the danger of alcoholism was so manifest that laws were passed restricting the sale of alcoholics in areas adjacent to military stations, and forbidding everywhere such sale to officers and soldiers in uniform. These restrictions, combined with strict discipline, vigorous exercise, ample amusement in camp, and instruction as to the dangers of alcoholic excess have had their anticipated effect in greatly reducing the incidence of drunkenness in the Army. The further development of restrictive measures resulted in the enactment of laws requiring universal prohibition for the period of the war, and these war-time restrictions doubtless exerted a marked influence in bringing about the constitutional amendment. Undoubtedly the more or less complete abstinence which the soldier has practiced during one or two years in the Army will have a decided influence in promoting temperance when he returns to civil life, regardless of the presence or absence of saloons in his vicinity.

Seventh. I think it is generally accepted that in recent years the tendency of the American youth has been in the direction of disrespect for authority, whether parental, municipal, or national. The strict discipline of military life, with its prompt unquestioning obedience to orders, has developed in millions of young men a respect for authority which can not fail to remain in some degree with them on their return home, making them better material for citizenship. As regards the many who through special ability and force of character attained commissioned or noncommissioned grades in the Army, these men have developed the faculty of exercising command justly and of exacting unquestioning obedience from their subordinates. This is a valuable acquirement which will tend to make them superior citizens, more fully able to direct the efforts of their communities in progressive and constructive policies.

Eighth. Typhoid fever, with the allied paratyphoid group, has always been the scourge of armies and still remains a scourge to civil communities. From armies it has practically disappeared, thanks to the use of antityphoid inoculation. This practice was made voluntary in our Army in 1909 and compulsory in 1912, with the result that typhoid was practically eliminated under peace conditions. The tests of this measure under field and war conditions came in 1911 and in 1916 on the Mexican border and during the last two years in this country and in Europe. In the year 1916 we mobilized what then appeared to be a relatively large Army on the Mexican border, a force which approximated 150,000 men, for a period of about nine months, and in this force we had only 46 cases of typhoid with 1 death. The 1 death, as well as most of the cases of typhoid, were in persons who either had not completed the antityphoid inoculations or else were stricken before the inoculation was begun. During the World War for the period of 20 months from September 1, 1917, to May 2, 1919, the average strength of our Army was about 2,120,000, and in this vast aggregation which was in large part living under war conditions there were only 213 deaths from typhoid fever, many of which were due to typhoid contracted before the immunizing inoculation. Had the Civil War rate prevailed during the World War we should have had 51,000 deaths. Had the Spanish War rate obtained we would have had 68,000 deaths.

In the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps approximately 5,000,000 men have been given the inoculation, and are now returned to civil life protected for a period of unknown duration, but probably extending over several years. These men have also been protected against smallpox much more thoroughly than is the practice in civil life. The value of smallpox vaccination and antityphoid inoculation has been impressed on them, and their experience and advice will doubtless have a decided influence in directing public opinion toward the universal adoption of this twin keystone in the arch of preventive medicine.

In conclusion, I think it may safely be said that the country, as a result of the World War, is in a better situation than ever before to appreciate, support, and promote sanitary reform and adequate health legislation. The five millions who have served in the military forces for the most part appreciate the value of preventive medicine, personal hygiene, and sanitation. They would approve and promote advances along these lines in municipal health service. The men who have been protected from typhoid fever and smallpox will realize that the antivaccination propaganda promotes not liberty but rather license, license for one individual to neglect well-recognized prophylactic measures, and thereby to endanger the health of his neighbor. The experience which the former soldier has had with frequent physical examinations, designed to detect latent or incipient disease, should pave the way for a more general appreciation regarding the value of this measure, which certain life insurance companies have been endeavoring to popularize for several years back.

The extensive antiveneal propaganda carried out by the Army and by the social uplift organizations has at last brought this vital subject into the light, where it has been fearlessly discussed and vigorously attacked on every front. This work should continue and be amplified in civil communities now that the war is over. Along all lines of sanitary and uplift work we may expect militant progress through the development of a better type of democracy, resulting from the intimate association of soldiers in tent and barrack, the rich with the poor, the educated with the uneducated, the virtuous with the vicious, the American born with the foreign born. This intimate mingling, with its resulting interchange of ideas and broadening of mental horizons, can not fail to stimulate in the educated and the well-to-do a greater and more personal interest in the promotion of physical and moral well-being among their less fortunate fellow citizens and in the Nation as a whole. The above-mentioned happy results can not be obtained unless there is aid from those citizens, particularly the women, who did not join the colors. In some directions there is a tendency to scoff at the sanitary precautions taken by the Army and to designate such measures as unnecessary codding. Such an attitude will tend to make the home-coming soldier hesitate to put forward his newly acquired ideas. The fullest degree of benefit from the war, for the country as a whole, can be obtained only by the close sympathy and earnest assistance of the great mass of citizens who have already so warmly welcomed the returning veterans. The success of sanitation under military control during the building of the Panama Canal was a convincing proof that the health of a community can be enormously improved by the judicious expenditure of sufficient money under a strong central administration, unrestricted by prejudice, political influence, ultraconservatism, or narrow mindedness. The war has offered on a much larger scale a demonstration that public health is a purchasable commodity—the price thereof being not only gold, but also self-restraint, personal sacrifice, and hearty cooperation on the part of all concerned. May the lessons thus learned be not forgotten.

SALE OF SHIPS.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the question of the disposition of certain ships owned by the Government was under consideration this morning, the discussion being precipitated by the joint resolution offered by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. It is my purpose to briefly discuss the resolution and submit a few words concerning the policy which should be pursued by the Government with respect to a merchant marine. I did want to say at the time that matter was under consideration, but the opportunity was not afforded, that I was very much in sympathy with the object of the resolution in so far as it sought to prevent a sale of the ships now owned by the Government of the United States and used for passenger or for shipping purposes, at least until a policy had been adopted by the Government.

I am not a member of the Committee on Commerce, but have given some little attention to the question of our merchant marine and the method of handling the vessels owned and controlled by the Government through the Shipping Board. Soon after the armistice was declared I felt that there should be legislation which would determine the policy to be adopted by the Government. We had spent not only hundreds of millions but billions of dollars in the construction of ships and plants for the building of ships, and the program called for the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars more. Charges had been made of waste and extravagance by the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the Shipping Board, and some of the reports which had been made to Congress indicated that the greatest economy had not been observed by these organizations and that we could not hope for an efficient and economical administration by these organizations even in peace times.

I think Senators are convinced that all agencies of the Government are not only inefficient but are wasteful and extravagant. Our experience with the railroads demonstrates the truth of this statement. It has cost the United States more than \$700,000,000 to operate the railroads since the Executive order taking over the railroads was issued.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. To that amount should be added about \$375,000,000 of unliquidated damages growing out of depreciation, and so forth. Of course, those are simply claims and they will be very substantially reduced, but I wish to indicate that the \$700,000,000 of loss does not include the entire amount.

Mr. KING. I was going to add that in addition to that amount, as suggested by the Senator from Ohio, I have been advised that there will be presented to the Government claims aggregating hundreds of millions of dollars. One person who had given some consideration to the subject told me that he had no doubt that claims would be presented to the Government for unliquidated damages growing out of its possession and operation of the railroads to the amount of at least \$500,000,000, and that he had no doubt judgments would be rendered against the Government that would exceed a quarter of a billion dollars.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to get the Senator's idea on the proposition I mentioned this morning only briefly, that in dealing with the ships owned by the Government it might be advisable to lease them to the Panama Railroad Co., a corporation now operating a line of ships, and provide by law for the extension of their operations perhaps to other ports if it were necessary to put that in.

I realize that men honestly disagree as to whether the Government should retain the ships, but the Senator must know that one of the items of preparedness is ships, as well as men and guns, and, if we sell these ships, then in case of an emergency we would have to buy them back, and, of course, that would mean an immense loss. Has the Senator ever given any thought to the question of the ships owned by the Government being leased to the Panama Railroad Co. without any possible loss in taking them back the moment we needed them?

Mr. KING. I had given some thought to the subject of the Government leasing the ships to operating shipping corporations or to individuals and corporations who would undertake their operation in a legitimate and proper way.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, if they were leased to an ordinary corporation or person or partnership engaged in business and the Government did want to take them back, we would have to pay damages, very properly, for the loss of trade that had been built up, or if the lease provided that the Government could take them without paying damages, then the compensation clause in the lease would necessarily take that into consideration and it would be much reduced. Of course, that would be a loss, anyway; but there would be no use in making any arrangements in

a lease with the Panama Railroad Co. or any similar corporation that might be organized, except that it is all owned by the Government. It seems to me that, as I remember it in looking up the history of the corporation several years ago, I was unable to find anything about its operation of those ships that was not commendable. The things that any other corporation engaged in that kind of business would be doing and the objections that are ordinarily made to Government ownership and Government operation, as far as I was able to find, at least, did not exist in that particular case. It seems to me it is something that is well worthy of consideration in passing on the final disposition of these ships.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that it is a matter that ought to be taken into account in connection with the determination of the course which the Government should pursue in regard to its ships.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me, there is another idea I should like to suggest.

If the ships were operated by the Panama Railroad Co., or a similar corporation, one object, I take it, would be to develop trade; it would not necessarily be intended that financial profit should be made out of it. In other words, we have the ships; we do not want them to get away so far that we can not put our hand on them at any time we might need them. They could be utilized in building up trade, for instance, between our ports and South America, that everybody realizes is desirable and that business concerns do not go into because of the risk they would run. If we develop such trade, even though we lose money on a particular ship, it might be a matter that in the end would be really profitable to the country.

Mr. KING. There is very much in the suggestion made by my distinguished friend, and I am sure that idea will be developed, or at least it should be developed and given very serious consideration by the committee before it ages upon a plan dealing with this question. I am not familiar with the corporation to which the Senator referred and do not know of its operations, and therefore in the little thought which I have given to the subject I had not associated with the corporation to which the Senator refers the enterprise of taking over the ships of the Government and using them for carrying purposes. There are some who believe that the Government ought to own and operate the railroads, and that the Government ought to own and operate the ships. There are men who believe in the nationalization of industries in the United States, as there are men in England and in Russia who believe in such action in their respective countries. We have men in the United States who believe in the soviet form of government, in the destruction of private initiative, in the overthrow of the splendid system under which our Government has grown to greatness and to power.

I am not one of that number. I believe that the Government of the United States has become great, and the people of the United States have become the greatest people in the world, because of the form of government and the social and economic conditions which prevail here. We believe in individualism. We believe in the right of men and women to work out their own destinies, in a government free from the clammy, tyrannous, oppressive hand of paternalistic and autocratic power. It would be folly in the extreme to abandon the method and system of policies, political and economic, that have made this Nation great, and follow false and dangerous doctrines, which inevitably would lead to economic and political ruin.

Mr. President, it is absolutely impossible in our form of government to secure proper economies in the administration of governmental affairs. Civil service and all other devices have failed and will continue to fail to secure efficient and economical administration of the Government. If time permitted I would discuss some of the causes that produce these effects, but it is sufficient to say that all dispassionate investigators have reached the conclusion that there has been inefficiency and extravagance in undertakings on the part of the Government. In the construction of buildings and roads the record is the same. Whether employees be trained officers or civilians or those who are found upon the list of classified employees, there is but slight difference in the ultimate results.

The highest degree of efficiency and economy result from private ownership and operation of business enterprises. Our Nation owes its primacy in the world to the form of government under which we live and to the individualism which it has developed. The American people have been encouraged to develop initiative and those splendid Anglo-Saxon traits which make a people free and progressive. In a little more than a hundred years our Nation has grown from a mere handful of people until it is the strongest, most powerful, and progressive in the world;

its people are the most prosperous and enjoy the highest degree of liberty.

Not only in material wealth but in intellectual possessions, in the spiritual and moral wealth, the people of this Nation outstrip the world. These great achievements have resulted from the repudiation of the idea that the Government and those in authority should control the lives and activities of the people. Paternalism has been reprobated by the American people. The tyranny of socialism has not been accepted, but everywhere in our broad land the people have been taught that the triumph of the Nation as a whole depends upon the strength of the individual units within the Republic. Our scholars, our educators, our teachers, our publicists, our preachers, as well as our political leaders, have cried aloud for the independence of the individual, for the development of self, and for individual expansion. Party creeds have rested upon the proposition of the equality of the individual and of the right to independence, to freedom of thought and to freedom of action.

While there has been regard for social justice and recognition of the responsibilities that follow from association of individuals in groups, communities, and States, and a conception of the obligations due from individuals to each other and to the social organism, the American people have never lost sight of the benefits flowing from self-development and the freedom of the individual. And so we have found the great leaders in finance, in business, in all movements making for progress and the welfare of the people coming from the ranks of labor, from the farms, and fields, and factories, and they caught the spirit and inspiration of this Republic, their latent powers were developed, and their genius and ability made them potential forces for the Nation's development. The great enterprises of the Nation came from the genius of the individual, and our future success depends upon the perpetuity of a policy that recognizes individual worth and personal and individual independence.

It is important that we adopt a rational policy in dealing with our merchant marine. I have been impressed for months with the necessity of prompt action by Congress. I communicated with the former chairman of the Commerce Committee, the able Senator from Florida, and urged that legislation be enacted at an early date that would declare the policy of the Government. I also suggested to the present able chairman of the committee, soon after his appointment as chairman, that at an early date his committee should formulate legislation that would deal with the question. I knew that there were influences at work seeking to have the Government retain the railroads and operate them, and also to retain the ships owned by the Government and operate them, and to have the Government build additional ships for operation. I believed this course to be unwise. I felt that the Government would fail in the operation of ships as it had failed in the operation of the railroads. Investigation showed that the Government had wasted millions and tens of millions of dollars in its shipbuilding program, and I felt sure that waste and extravagance would follow further efforts to build ships and to operate them.

However, I was opposed to the sale of any ships owned by the Government except in those instances in which it was clear the vessels sold would not be required for our merchant marine, and under exceptional circumstances, until a policy had been determined upon by the Government. Accordingly, when it was reported that Mr. Hurley, the former chairman of the Shipping Board, intended to sell some of the ships owned by the Government, I appealed to him to abandon such a course and await congressional action. I am opposed now to the sale of ships referred to in the resolution of the Senator from Arizona, as well as other ships controlled and operated by the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation, until the future course of the Government in dealing with this important subject has been fully determined upon.

The members of the Shipping Board, though, have a right to insist that Congress act and act quickly in regard to this matter. The members of the board should know whether they are to continue constructing ships and whether there will be appropriations made by Congress to support a shipbuilding program. They can not determine whether to maintain present shipping yards or dispose of the ships. Not knowing what the policy of the Government is to be, they can not determine the character of the ships to be built, if any, or what expenditures should be made by their organization.

The comprehensive powers conferred upon the board for war purposes were quite extraordinary, and naturally, now that peace has come, must cause hesitancy upon the part of the members of the board and uncertainty as to what course shall be pursued. We owe it to the corporations that are handling our shipping matters to advise them at an early date what course the Government will pursue. It is important that they should

know whether the Government is to retain the many shipyards which have been built at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars or whether they are to be sold. They must know whether the Government intends to hold a large number of ships which it owns or whether they are to be disposed of. It is manifest that the operation of these ships in some instances, if not all, will entail considerable loss. I know the claim is made that the profits in shipping at the present time are large. That may be true where economies are practiced and where vessels operate along favorable routes. It is, I believe, quite certain that if we attempt to develop our foreign commerce with many parts of the world and the Government is to operate ships for that purpose there will be losses. The Shipping Board must know whether Congress will approve of a course that will result in losses which can only be met by increased taxation to be met by the people. The subject is one so important as to call for the highest statesmanship.

Before the Civil War the policy which we had pursued developed a strong merchant marine. The American flag was found in almost every port of the world, and exports from America and imports to America were carried in American ships. After the Civil War, for reasons that are known to most people, we lost our merchant marine. I have been told by Americans who traveled extensively that often they have seen in foreign ports scores of ships flying the flags of many nations, but no American flag was seen. Foreign ships carried American commerce, and we were subject to the rates and discriminations which the owners of the foreign vessels imposed. In other words, our commerce was largely at their mercy. Such a condition must not be permitted to exist again. We must have a merchant marine adequate for the needs of this country. Our prosperity is dependent upon our foreign trade and commerce. We can not be isolated; we do not desire isolation.

If our trade with other nations were cut off, financial ruin and disaster would come to the American people. Our agricultural products are needed in various parts of the world. We must find foreign markets for our manufactured products as well as for our raw materials. Europe needs our cotton, our copper, our flour, and beef, and manufactured goods. It is vital for the trade of South America that we employ every legitimate means to bring the Latin Republics and the United States into harmonious relations. The products of South America must come here, and we must ship to those nations our surplus of which they stand in need. Notwithstanding the weakened condition of Europe, we will lose in South America and Central America unless we act, and act promptly.

Mr. President, if the Shipping Board intends to dispose of the German vessels referred to in the resolution offered by the Senator from Arizona, or other ships, before Congress has announced a policy for the Nation with regard to our merchant marine, I should be in favor of a joint resolution which would prevent such action.

With my present view I should be in favor of a policy that would call for the sale of the ships controlled by the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation. But the ships should not be sold immediately or forced upon the market. A policy should be pursued that would bring the Government a fair and just compensation for the vessels. Moreover, all vessels sold should be disposed of to American citizens or corporations organized in our country. They should be American ships owned by Americans, and they should fly the American flag. The sale should also be so made that no monopoly would be created or no shipping trust developed. In other words, the Government should gradually dispose of its ships, but in the matter should proceed in such a way as to develop our merchant marine and strengthen it, and bring a fitting reward to the Government for the expenditures it has been compelled to make in the construction of shipyards and the building of vessels. I sincerely hope that within a few days the Committee on Commerce will submit to the Senate for consideration a comprehensive, rational plan which will prove satisfactory to the American people and under which we may be assured that we will have a merchant marine adequate for the needs of our country.

Mr. President, I have imperfectly stated some of my views upon the question of our merchant marine. Of course, there may a situation develop which may compel, at least for some time, the United States to retain the vessels built and acquired for commercial purposes. Our ships must not be sacrificed, and no private shipping monopoly must be permitted.

The entire question must be considered in a broad American way; the welfare of our country must be of paramount consideration. Until we have made full and exhaustive examination of the subject and agreed upon a safe and rational policy, we must retain the ships.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1699) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Keyes	Overman	Thomas
Ball	King	Page	Trammell
Beckham	Kirby	Phipps	Underwood
Brandegee	Knox	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Calder	Lodge	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Capper	McCormick	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	McKellar	Smith, Ga.	Warren
Dillingham	Moses	Smith, Md.	Watson
Harris	Myers	Smoot	Williams
Hitchcock	New	Stanley	
Kellogg	Norris	Sterling	
Kendrick	Nugent	Sutherland	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The names of the absent Senators were called, and Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. McCUMBER, and Mr. TOWNSEND answered to their names when called.

Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. COLT, Mr. OWEN, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. NELSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on the amendment of the committee on page 2 of the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask to have the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 1, after the word "include," it is proposed to insert the following words:

American employees of the Panama Canal above the grade of laborer, superintendents of United States national cemeteries, and employees under the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds, and—

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota upon what theory he includes the employees of the Panama Canal Zone in this bill?

Mr. STERLING. On the theory that the positions of the American employees of the Panama Canal above the grade of laborer are quite permanent and are more nearly analogous to the classified civil service than those of other employees not in the classified civil service.

Mr. KING. How many employees are there there?

Mr. STERLING. I can not inform the Senator as to the number of employees in the service above that grade.

Mr. KING. Have any of the bills heretofore introduced contained any provision under which the employees in the Canal Zone should be given pensions?

Mr. STERLING. I am not sure as to that. Let me say to the Senator that all employees regularly in the Government service and whose positions are quite permanent in their nature might properly be included in any bill providing for annuities on retirement. We have not seen fit to do it in this bill. We have thought the classified civil service designated in itself those who are in the permanent employ of the Government. There are these exceptional cases, some of which are put in by way of amendment, where the positions are in their nature permanent, although they are not in the classified civil service.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator will remember that the employees in the Panama Canal Zone receive certain advantages that the employees of the Government in the United States proper do not receive, and I wondered why this bill was to extend to those employees.

Mr. STERLING. I do not know in what way employees in the Panama Canal Zone have advantages over other employees. The Senator from Utah may be able to inform me in that regard; and, if the Senator will permit me, I do not know that that is any reason why they should not be included in the provisions of this bill. There may be some special reason that the Senator has in mind. If he has in mind any such reason, I should be glad to have him state it.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know whether or not the common laborers on the Panama Canal, and the other Government employees as well, are all Americans?

Mr. STERLING. I am not sure as to that, but my impression is that those to whom this provision would apply are all Americans. The laborers, of course, are not all Americans. Probably there are some that are, but they probably are for the most part not Americans. I take it for granted, however, that the clerical positions to which this provision would apply are filled by Americans.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that, not having had time to give the matter examination, and this being the first time I remember the question ever arising as to whether employees in the Panama Canal Zone should be provided for under a retirement bill, I am totally unable to say how many are involved and why they should be in this bill. I thought perhaps the Senator had that information presented to him at the time the amendment was suggested to the bill.

Mr. STERLING. I will say that I saw no great reason why they should not be included in the bill, assuming, of course, that their positions were more or less permanent in nature; and hence, without taking the time to investigate as to the number of employees who would come within the provisions of the bill, I consented to the amendment, and I think it is a reasonable provision.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, would the Senator object to giving us the sources of information upon which he based this amendment?

Mr. STERLING. I have just stated that I have not examined into the question of the number of employees, but I think the Senator from Utah knows very well the nature of the employment of those to whom this amendment would apply, and that they are for the most part, anyhow, persons holding official or clerical positions in the Panama Canal service.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice, upon reading the amendment carefully, that it provides that they shall be American employees, and that answers one of the questions that I asked the Senator.

Mr. STERLING. Yes. That had escaped me for the time being, my attention being called to it at this moment.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that all the employees in the Panama Canal Zone are under the civil service?

Mr. STERLING. It applies only to those who are in the civil service in the Canal Zone.

Mr. SMOOT. The same provisions apply to the employees of the Panama Canal that apply to the employees in the United States in the classified civil service.

Mr. STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Can the Senator give any reason why, while this bill, or one containing similar provisions, has been considered for several years by various committees, no provision was suggested under which the employees in the Panama Canal Zone would be put on the pension list?

Mr. STERLING. I can not give any reason why it was not considered. It may never have been presented, and it probably never was presented, to any of the committees which have had this bill under consideration before. It simply appealed to the committee as a reasonable provision to be incorporated in this bill. We saw no reason why those employees should not be included.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit another inquiry?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. KING. I find in the amendment which the committee has submitted the following words:

Superintendents of United States national cemeteries.

They are to get pensions. My understanding has been that those appointments were, or have been, political. Does the Senator say that they have been removed from the political status, and have now been placed in the classified service?

Mr. STERLING. No; I do not say they have been removed from the political status and are covered into the classified civil service at all. I do not say that. I think the reason for the amendment, as it applies to superintendents of United States national cemeteries, is that their positions are considered permanent, and I think they are not subject to removal on change of administration. I do not think they can be called political positions. I am quite sure they can not be.

Mr. KING. As I remember—although my memory is very uncertain—they are subject to appointment by the President.

Mr. STERLING. Yes; I think so.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator recall whether that is by and with the advice and consent of the Senate?

Mr. STERLING. It is not by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. They do not come within that class of officials.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator say that the law fixes their tenure as being for life? If the law does not give them a life tenure, then it is clear that they are political positions and that

they may be changed at the will of the President or the appointing power.

Mr. STERLING. I would not like to say that their appointments are for life, but my thought is that they are, or during good behavior in their positions. I do not think their places depend upon politics or a change in the administration of the Government.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator understand that they are appointed by the incoming administrations?

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, this thought occurs to me: These superintendents would hardly want to be within the provisions of this bill if they were subject to removal with every change of administration, because they can not have served the time which would allow them benefits under the bill. Their minimum period of service must be 15 years in order that they may share in the benefits provided for in the bill.

Mr. KING. That is precisely what I had in mind. My recollection was—and I have a very imperfect one—that there was no life tenure given to these employees; that they were appointed by the incoming administrations, and, of course, some of them were reappointed, or perhaps continued without any appointment. To give them the status of pensioners, under the circumstances, seems to me to be rather inconsistent with the theory of the bill, and might prove a menace to a fair and desirable retirement system. As I understand, the bill proceeds upon the idea that the employees of the United States who have come within the civil-service rules, and have given years of their lives to the Government service, should receive pensions. If temporary and political appointments are to be considered eligible for pensions, then it would seem that the theory of the bill is challenged.

Mr. STERLING. They are probably appointed without reference to the time for which they shall serve, subject to removal for cause, as any other civil-service employee might be.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. NUGENT. Can the Senator from South Dakota advise the Senate whether the superintendents of these national cemeteries are not old soldiers and now on the pension list?

Mr. STERLING. Largely, I think.

Mr. KING. Then I want to inquire further, if the Senator will permit me, as to the other provision of the amendment, namely:

and employees under the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds.

Mr. STERLING. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. KING. The question is whether or not those appointees are permanent. My understanding was that they were usually appointed by the captain of police or the person having charge of the Capitol Grounds, and that the appointments were made as often as a change was made in the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds.

Mr. STERLING. I think not. I think these positions are more or less permanent in their nature, and do not depend upon political changes or changes of administration. Otherwise the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds would not have asked that these employees be included in this bill, and he did make the request.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit another inquiry? Does not that include the watchmen and the policemen who are appointed from time to time, and some of whom are appointed under the patronage of Senators?

Mr. STERLING. No; it does not include employees of that class.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator indicate the nature of these employees, and substantially the number?

Mr. STERLING. They fill various positions—positions of trust, the position of engineer, and so forth. They are regular employees of the Government and are under the supervision of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds. These are not patronage appointees.

Mr. KING. Is that the only information—and I am not desirous of being critical—that the Senator can give in regard to the number of such employees and their duties?

Mr. STERLING. Yes. The Senator from Utah will note the succeeding provisions of this paragraph. It includes the employees of the Library of Congress and the Botanic Garden. These are not regularly in the classified civil service; but it was thought, because of the permanent nature of their positions, that they could be rightfully and properly included within the provisions of this act. But note what follows. It excludes, first, of course, persons appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and then it is provided that it may be extended by Executive order, upon recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, to include any employee or group of employees in the

civil service of the United States not classified at the time of the passage of the act. I think this is similar to the provisions of other bills that have been introduced.

Mr. KING. I suggest to the able Senator that there may be danger in this amendment being an entering wedge to a radical change in his plan, a change which may endanger a retirement bill in behalf of classified employees. It may be regarded as paving the way for pensions for all employees of the Government regardless of service or status.

If pensions are given to gardeners in the Botanic Garden and to employees in the Capitol, to persons having political appointments and serving in temporary or other positions outside of the classified service, it may excite fears that this pension system is too far-reaching, and it may induce the belief that efforts will be made to make every position in the Government a permanent one and one within the civil service. It would seem that if they shall be pensioned we put the stamp of permanency on their employment, and we will be compelled, if not immediately within a short time, to elevate them from their temporary positions of employment and place them in the category of permanent employees of the Government. May it not be urged that this plan will lay the foundation for the establishment of a pension system that will extend not to thousands and tens of thousands but to hundreds of thousands and possibly millions, so that ultimately there will be but two classes of people in the United States—the man who draws a pension from the Government of the United States and the farmer and the laborer and the taxpayer, upon whose backs will rest the burdens of paying the taxes of the Government and carrying the pensioners. Instead of every laboring man carrying a soldier upon his back, as it was alleged was the situation in Germany before the war, every laboring man in the United States may be carrying a pensioner upon his back. I am not making these suggestions in opposition to a fair and proper measure, but for the purpose of having the chairman of the committee consider whether his proposal may not incite demands for pensions of some sort by all who render any kind of service to the Government.

Mr. STERLING. I think if the Senator will read the terms of the bill carefully his mind may be relieved of fear of any such situation as he describes. The employment must be a permanent employment in order that the employee may participate in the benefits of the bill. It must be at least 15 years of employment, so that does away at once with the idea that those who are in the temporary employment will receive benefits under the bill.

The bill provides that the President shall have the power in his discretion to exclude from the operations of the act any employee or group of employees in the classified civil service whose tenure of office or employment is intermittent or of uncertain duration, so here may be those or groups of them in what is termed the classified civil service, and yet if it is determined after all that their service is intermittent or temporary the President may exclude them from the provisions of the bill. Anyhow, there must be 15 years of service before a man can become an annuitant under the bill and he must have contributed from his salary every month during the 15 years.

Mr. KING. If I understand the Senator's position, it is that a person may not know whether he is a permanent employee of the Government until he has served the Government a full 15 years. When he reaches 15 years' service, then he will know that he is in the permanent service of the Government, but until he serves 15 years he will not know whether he is in the temporary or permanent employ of the Government.

Mr. STERLING. The position of the Senator is that the employee is bound under the law to know that if he serves the Government for 15 years continuously in the classified civil service he will be entitled to an annuity under the bill. He, of course, performs his part by contributing out of his salary toward the payment of the annuity. He will know that and will be held to know it.

Mr. KING. Let me ask the Senator, Do employees of the Capitol, if there shall be any here who have served 15 years, know that they are permanent employees of the Government? Are they permanent employees of the Government or are they only temporary employees of the Government?

Mr. STERLING. If they are in the classified civil service, there is no question about their being permanent employees of the Government, by entering into the classified civil service through a competitive examination and being placed upon the list ready for assignment when vacancies occur.

Mr. KNOX. May I make an inquiry? Is there any provision made for the protection of an employee who might die, say, at the end of 10 or 12 years, having contributed up to that time? Is there any provision made for his reimbursement?

Mr. STERLING. There is ample provision in the bill. His estate or legal representatives receive the sum of all the contributions, with 4 per cent compound interest.

Mr. KING. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a matter concerning which I made inquiry a moment ago, namely, the status of superintendents of United States national cemeteries. Since I addressed my inquiry to the Senator I have hurriedly looked at the statute and find that it reads as follows:

The Secretary of War shall cause to be erected at the principal entrance of each national cemetery a suitable building to be occupied as a porter's lodge and shall appoint a meritorious and trustworthy superintendent to reside therein for the purpose of guarding and protecting the cemetery and giving information to parties visiting the same.

The next section provides:

That the superintendents of national cemeteries shall be selected from meritorious and trustworthy soldiers, either commissioned officers or enlisted men of the Volunteer or Regular Army, who have been honorably mustered out or discharged from the service of the United States and who may have been disabled for active field service.

I was in error in suggesting that they were appointed by the President, and the Senator, it would appear, did not have accurate information as to the status of those individuals. Under the law these employees hold their positions under the Secretary of War. He may name the officials and of course he may change them. Each succeeding Secretary could supersede all who are serving in that capacity and place other persons in their places.

Mr. STERLING. He is not likely to do that, and if he does or if he has the power to do it, he simply deprives the superintendents of the national cemeteries of the benefits of the bill. That is all. It may happen, if the Senator's view is correct, that any succeeding Secretary of War may remove any superintendent, but it would, of course, prevent his obtaining the benefits of the bill.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator feel, if we adopt the amendment which he has offered, that the contention would immediately be made that Congress contemplated that those employees should hold their positions permanently, and that if any Secretary of War attempted to displace them the position would be taken that his action was in contravention of law, and if that position were not upheld appeals would be made to Congress to make those positions permanent?

Mr. STERLING. I will frankly say to the Senator from Utah that I would not regret for a moment that kind of an interpretation being put upon the law. That, however, would not prevent the Secretary of War from removing for cause.

Mr. KING. As far as I am concerned, as long as men in that position perform their duties, I would feel much more in favor of protecting them and giving them permanent positions than I would younger men—those who had not fought to save the Union as these veterans have done.

Mr. STERLING. I think that the Senator will agree with me in that respect. If by law there should be the inducement—not the compulsion but the inducement—for the Secretary of War to keep a man who was efficient in that service, we might well do it.

Mr. KING. If I understand the amendment offered by the committee, the objection which I have to all of its provisions and to its spirit arises from the fact that, as I interpret it, it will be regarded as the foundation for the demand that persons now occupying temporary positions in the service of the Government shall be treated as beneficiaries under this bill and entitled to all of its benefits. In other words, it will be made the basis of a demand to place upon the pension roll tens of thousands of temporary employees of the Government who now fill positions in all parts of our land and the innumerable hosts who are outside of the civil-service law.

Mr. STERLING. I think the bill in that regard is as well safeguarded as any bill can be. I will say to the Senator that many countries require only 10 years of service before the employee will be entitled to a pension or an annuity. The pending bill requires 15 years of service. I think the bill in all respects is safeguarded against mere temporary employments and against the claim on the part of temporary employees that they are entitled to the benefits of it.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator is it not the paramount purpose of this bill to pension those who are within the classified service?

Mr. STERLING. It pertains in general terms to the classified civil service, with these exceptions—those named in the amendment and the exceptions which follow in the original bill providing that the President of the United States may extend the provisions of the act to those whose employment is permanent employment, though they be not in what is technically known as the classified civil service, and a few other classes named in the bill.

Mr. KING. The Senator will pardon me for the apparent repetition, but does he not think if we intend to give the classified service the position of merit and esteem which it ought to have it ought to be perfectly clear that the pensionable status shall not be extended to those who are outside of the classified service, and ought we not further to emphasize the proposition that employees of the Government may not be elevated from nonclassified into the classified service merely for the purpose of getting pensions?

I do not affirm, however, that the granting of pensions to those only who are within the classified service will close the door to pensions to other employees of the Government. It is possible that the hundreds of thousands of nonclassified service employees will soon be knocking at the doors of Congress and availing themselves of every avenue of approach to Congress demanding that the benefits of this bill, modified, of course, in some respects, shall be extended to them.

Mr. STERLING. I think we may be able to meet that situation when it is actually before us. It surely is not in the pending bill. When the President does extend the provisions of the bill to include those not in the classified service, it must be upon the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission are primarily interested in getting on to the eligible list those who have taken a competitive examination, and they will be loth to recommend for the benefits of the bill any who are not now in the classified civil service or who do not enter that service hereafter.

Mr. KING. My experience with the civil service and my knowledge of its activities and its work lead to a result entirely different from that just stated by my distinguished friend. I believe that the Civil Service Commission—and I do not make this statement by way of criticism, because I think they are sincere in the view which they take—would like to have under the classified service practically all persons who are working for the Government.

Mr. STERLING. But that does not involve the putting of them in the classified civil service. It only involves the recommendation of the commission in regard to certain persons not in the classified civil service, persons whose positions are permanent, whose employment is of a nature to make it reasonable and natural that they should share in the provisions of the bill—not that they come into the classified civil service. It is for that purpose that the provision is inserted in the bill.

Mr. KING. I do not know that the Senator understood my statement or whether I made myself clear. I understood the Senator to say that there would be a check upon the advancement from the nonclassified to the classified service in order to get pensions, that no one could be put into the classified service except upon recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, and I replied to that by stating that my experience with the Civil Service Commission—and I did not say it by way of criticism—and my knowledge of its work and activities led me to the conclusion that it was ambitious to have every employee of the Government within the classified service, and that therefore it would seize upon every opportunity, if its recommendations were to be controlling or, indeed, to be persuasive, of elevating from the nonclassified service into the pensionable status every employee of the Government.

Mr. STERLING. I do not share in the fears of the Senator from Utah in that regard. I said a while ago, and I believe it is true, that the Civil Service Commission will be slow to recommend that the provisions of the pending bill be extended to others not in the classified civil service. They are interested primarily in having men go into that service through a competitive examination.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I move an amendment to the amendment offered by the committee, to strike out the following words, commencing on line 1, page 2, "American employees of the Panama Canal above the grade of laborer and employees under the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds," so that it will read as follows if my amendment shall prevail:

The provisions of this act shall include superintendents of the United States national cemeteries and employees of the Library of Congress and the Botanic Gardens—

And so forth.

I give notice to the Senator that I shall move to strike out, after we have disposed of the committee amendments, the words following the committee amendment, beginning "employees of the Library of Congress and the Botanic Gardens." In the amendment proposed by the committee I leave in the words "superintendents of the United States national cemeteries." In view of the fact that they are soldiers of the Civil War and in view of their heroic service, I am willing that they shall get the benefits of this act.

Mr. STERLING. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will not prevail. I think there are good reasons, and I have already stated them, why the committee amendment should prevail in its entirety. It excludes Panama Canal laborers and it is confined to American employees. There is good reason for retaining the amendment as to the employees under the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds. They practically stand on the same footing as civil-service employees or employees in the classified service of the Government. I hope that the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator from South Dakota several questions in regard to the matter? The report does not show how many members of the committee concurred in it. I should like to know what members of his committee have concurred in the report?

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think all but two or three members of the committee concurred in the report. There might have been four members of the committee who did not concur in the report. In addition to those who were present at the time the report was determined upon, I personally saw, I think, every other member of the committee who indorsed the bill and signified his readiness and willingness that the bill should be reported.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask how many members of the committee were present when the bill was voted to be reported out?

Mr. STERLING. I do not know that I can inform the Senator exactly how many were present when the bill was ordered reported out, but others had been present prior to the time the report was agreed upon by those present in the committee. I think, all told, there were five members present at the time of the action of the committee in ordering the bill reported out. I can give the names of Senators who were present at the meeting.

Mr. POMERENE. I should be very glad to have them.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, let me suggest that the inquiry of the Senator from Ohio, it strikes me, is a little unusual, and that the object of the inquiry now is simply to create some prejudice against the bill. I should like to dispose of the bill on its clear merits, I will say to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. So should I; and I do not mean to be in the least offensive in making these inquiries. I will say to the Senator very frankly that there are, to my certain knowledge, three members of the committee who are very much opposed to the bill.

Mr. STERLING. Yes; and I think I know who they are. Is the Senator from Ohio one of them?

Mr. POMERENE. I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from Ohio is not at present a member of the committee; but let me say to the Senator from Ohio that he was invited to be present at the hearings before the committee and also at the executive session of the committee. I extended that invitation personally to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes, Mr. President, that is true; but at a time when I was engaged in other work, and it was impossible for me to be there. At least one other member of the committee has said to me that he had not given the matter enough attention to be able to speak of its merits.

I want to indulge the hope that the eminent chairman of the committee will consent to the bill with all amendments and the report being recommitted. Whether I were for or against this bill, I confess that, as a Senator of the United States, I would not feel justified in voting for it with only the information which is contained in the hearings and in the report which has been submitted. The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoor] and myself have given considerable attention to this matter; we have taken such data as are included in the report and in the hearings and we have submitted that information to Dr. Brown, the Chief of the Bureau of Efficiency, together with other information which we had gathered when I was chairman of the committee; and the conclusions which are drawn by the present chairman of the committee and ourselves are so variant that it seems to me that common prudence on the part of the Senate of the United States suggests that an opportunity be given to the committee, by the employment of proper experts, to determine whether the chairman's conclusions are right or ours are right. If it can be demonstrated that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoor] and myself are wrong in our conclusions, we do not want to stand by the assertions we have made. However, I am going to interpose at this moment a motion to recommit the bill, with all amendments which have been proposed, and the report of the committee itself for further hearings, investigations, and report. I do that as a friend of the cause of retirement.

I do not want to discuss the motion to-night; there are only a few Senators present, and it is a matter of such vast importance that I think Senators owe it to themselves to be here and to determine what they want to do. Upon this motion, if there is an adjournment to-night, I shall ask to be heard, probably for 10 or 15 minutes, in the morning. I do not intend to speak long, but I am going to interpose the motion in the interest of justice, both to the Government and to the employees. It is now half past 4 o'clock, and, if the Senator is not willing to consent to have the motion sustained, I want to ask whether he will not consent to an adjournment at this time?

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KING. There is an important matter here that I think we ought to dispose of this evening, in which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] is interested, namely, a resolution in regard to the alleged purpose of the Shipping Board to sell certain ships of the United States. I think it is so important that we ought to try to secure action upon that resolution this evening, unless the Committee on Commerce is ready to recommend some different action.

Mr. POMERENE. I am disposed to agree with the suggestion just made, and for that reason I will yield the floor. I feel very deeply in that matter, just as much as does the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have sent upstairs for the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones], who is chairman of the Committee on Commerce. In the meantime, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed and lie on the table subject to call, if we do not pass it. I will put it in the alternative. I want to be certain that the resolution is printed to-night, unless we pass it. I want to have it in a position where it may be called up the first thing in the morning, if not passed to-night.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Where is the resolution now?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is on the table for the present.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator refer to the resolution that was up earlier to-day?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. It merely requests the Shipping Board to defer action in the matter of the sale of the ships until action shall have been taken by Congress.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I might suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that the Senator from Washington is interested in this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I have already sent for him. He will be here in just a moment.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not think action ought to be taken in his absence.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator, and I have already sent for the Senator from Washington.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, it has been my attitude with regard to the report of the Committee on Commerce, to which reference has been made, that if that report were presented here this afternoon while the unfinished business was under discussion, I would ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of considering that report. Now, however, pending the presentation of that report, I wish to say, in answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, that I shall oppose any proposition for the recommitment of the bill to the committee, not saying now as to when that motion may be disposed of.

Mr. President, I simply say that the more I have considered the pending bill, what it provides for, what the Government will have to do, and what the employees will have to do under the terms of the bill, the more confidence have I in the justice and the equity of the bill. I am satisfied that here we are on firm ground. Everyone admits, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Pomerene] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoor] admit, the necessity of some civil-service-retirement system, and I do not believe anything more just to the Government or more just to the employees can be worked out than has been wrought out in the pending bill.

Of course, we have been more or less discouraged from time to time, as the bill has been under discussion, because so few Senators have been in attendance to hear the discussion and to take into account the statistics which have been produced; but before any motion to recommit is acted on I want to present some further argument and some further statistics in regard to the cost to the Government. I am ready for the present to give way and have the bill temporarily laid aside, pending the report of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am advised by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] that he is not at this moment ready to proceed. I simply wish to say that I am just as earnestly in favor of some proper scheme of retirement as is the

Senator from South Dakota; our investigation has brought us to the same conclusion in that behalf; but I differ completely from the Senator in his statement as to the justice or equity of this bill. I should like the opportunity if I could—and I know that other Senators on the committee would like to have such an opportunity—to cross-examine some of the expert actuaries, and it would be most interesting, from a legal standpoint, to hear what they might have to say in answer to some questions. But the Senator from Tennessee is now ready to proceed, and I will yield.

SALE OF SHIPS.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, is now present. I wish to say to him that I have asked unanimous consent at once to bring up the resolution in regard to the proposed sale of certain ships, and would like to hear what he has to say.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think I can make a statement that will be satisfactory to the Senator from Tennessee. The committee has been considering the matter involved in his resolution. Judge Payne has stated to the committee that the assertion that the Shipping Board has agreed or promised to sell all these 30 ships to one company—the International Mercantile Marine Co.—is absolutely baseless and untrue; that, to the contrary, the Shipping Board has formally passed a resolution to the effect that they will not sell all of these ships to one company. That disposes of that proposition.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Did Judge Payne say that they really intended to sell the ships at this time at all?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was just going on to make a statement with regard to that.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Bids have been received upon 20 individual ships from, I believe, 12 different companies and corporations. The Shipping Board, however, has not accepted any of those bids; on the contrary, it has called for additional bids, or has decided to hold what is called an auction on next Monday.

This will be not an auction in the ordinary sense, where if there is more than one bid the sale must be made to the highest bidder, but it is simply designed to give everybody an opportunity to come in and submit proposals for the purchase of the 20 ships. The bids submitted will amount to proposals, the board reserving the right to reject them all.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. They are public, open proposals?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; open proposals, which anybody who desires may submit.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Submitted in the presence of the other people, who will have an opportunity to submit higher bids at once?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that is the reason they call it an auction.

Mr. KING. And bids may be made separately or for the entire number of ships; that is, an individual may bid for one ship or for more than one?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Or for 20 ships.

Mr. KING. For the entire number?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes. The Senator was not here when I made the statement that Judge Payne had stated that there is absolutely no foundation for the statement that the board has agreed to sell all of these 30 ships to one company, but that, to the contrary, the board has passed a formal resolution that it will not sell all these ships to one company.

Open bids, as the Senator from Georgia suggests, which may be submitted by everybody—and they can be raised, and so forth—will be received on Monday; but the Government will not be bound to accept any of them, and they will not be accepted at that time, but after they are received, then the Shipping Board will give them careful consideration, taking into account all the conditions and circumstances. Judge Payne has assured the committee that no action will be taken, but that he will appear before the committee and present all the facts and all the circumstances, the bids and everything of that sort, upon the request of the committee, and will not act in any way until the committee has had ample time to consider these matters. The committee felt that we could then get much better information even than we have had to-day; that we would know all the facts in the whole situation as developed by the bids, and then the committee could make its recommendation.

Judge Payne further assured the committee that if the Senate or the committee should pass a resolution and send it to him expressing it as the sense of the Senate, or of the committee alone, that this sale should not under any circumstances be con-

summated, he would not consummate it. So it seems to me the matter is left where it will be open for the action of the committee or of the Senate after we have gotten all of the facts and all of the conditions and these new proposals, if there are any made, are known.

It was the sense of the committee that the wisest thing under the circumstances to do was to wait, let the bids be received on Monday, and then probably call Judge Payne before the committee on Tuesday. Under those circumstances—

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I was present at the greater part of the hearing, but I was not present at that part of the hearing where Judge Payne gave the assurance that no sale would be perfected until the committee had been consulted.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Until the committee had had full opportunity to consider the whole matter.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I heard him express very vigorously the opinion that the ships ought to be sold.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; he did that.

Mr. MCKELLAR. And that he felt the Shipping Board, rather than the Congress, should be allowed to exercise its views, as I understood him.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not understand him quite to that effect.

Mr. MCKELLAR. But that, if requested by the committee to hold it up, he would do so. I did not understand, however, that he was to hold it up until he came before the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; he assured us that he would do so. That proposition was presented to him, I think, while the Senator was there.

Mr. MCKELLAR. To be absolutely on the safe side, does the Senator see any objection to a resolution being passed by the Senate, by unanimous consent, asking him to do so?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, in view of the positive assurances of Judge Payne, I feel that in a way it would really be a reflection upon him.

Mr. MCKELLAR. No; quite the contrary. He asked that the committee do so.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; he did with reference to the sale or disposition, but we asked Judge Payne if there was any reason why action should not be delayed until he had received all these proposals and bids, and so forth, and then have him come to the committee, and he said no. Then the committee asked him—

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. To quiet the apprehension of Senators, I want to state that Mr. Hearst has filed a bill of complaint here to enjoin the Shipping Board from proceeding with these sales, and that the order to show cause is returnable on the 16th.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I was going to state that, also.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Was the injunction granted?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The court has issued an order to show cause why they should not be enjoined, but I do not see any reason why that should particularly influence us. Judge Payne has assured us that he will do nothing without conferring further with the committee, and it does seem to me that that ought to be satisfactory.

Mr. MCKELLAR. My only purpose is to make it absolutely certain that there can not be any mistake about it—that these ships will not be sold by the Shipping Board until Congress has passed on the matter, because I think that ought not to be done. If the Senator is absolutely certain from the assurances he has received that that will not be done, it is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am sure of that, and I am satisfied that I can be just as sure of it now as I could be if a resolution on the subject were passed by the Senate, because the passage of a resolution does not add anything to the power of Judge Payne, nor does it take anything away from him. He has assured us that he will not sell the ships without conferring with the committee, and I am satisfied that his word is just as good as any resolution passed by the Senate.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Under those circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that my resolution may be printed and lie on the table in the usual way, unless there is objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That order will be made.

RECESS.

Mr. STERLING. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 14, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.